NATIONAL ANTI-SLAVERY STANDARD.

SYDNEY HOWARD GAY, Editor. | Without Concealment---Without Compromise. | JAMES RUSSELL LOWELL, Corresponding Editor.

VOLUME IX.---NO. 37. | NEW-YORK, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 8, 1849. | WHOLE NUMBER 453.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY,
BY THE
AMERICAN A. S. SOCIETY
At 142 Nassau Street, New-York.

☞ All communications for the paper, and letters relating to its pecuniary concerns, should be addressed to the Editor.

☞ Donations to the Treasury of the American Anti-Slavery Society may be forwarded to FRANCIS JACKSON, Treasurer, at Boston; or to S. H. GAY, Assistant Treasurer, at New-York.

TERMS.—Two Dollars per annum: Strictly in advance in all cases.

Selections.

PROCEEDINGS
OF A
CONVENTION OF SOUTHERN MEMBERS
OF CONGRESS.

JOHN C. CALHOUN'S MANIFESTO.

From the Washington Union.

CHAMBER OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,
WASHINGTON, Dec. 23.

Agreeably to a previous notice, at 7 o'clock, P. M. the following Senators and Representatives in Congress, from the Southern States assembled in the Chamber of the United States Senate, to wit:

OF THE SENATE—Messrs Hunter, Foote, Houston, Atchison, Metcalf, Fitzpatrick, Turney, Rusk, Calhoun, Butler, Davis of Miss. Yulee, Westcott, Johnson, of La. Underwood, Sebastian, Downs, and Johnson of Ga.

OF THE HOUSE.—Messrs. Inge, Gayle, Harris, Houston, of Ala. Cobb, of Ala. Bowdon, Featherson, Tompkins, Brown, of Miss. Harmanson, La Sere, Morse, Morehead, Boyd, Peyton, Clark, of Ky. Thibodeaux, Kaufman, Pillsbury, Barrow, Thomas, Staunton, Chase, Hill, Johnson, of Ark. King, of Ga. Iverson, Jones, of Ga. Harrison, Lumpkin, Cobb, of Ga. Stephens, Toombs, Wallace, Simpson, Woodward, Bott, Holmes, of S. C. Venable, Meade, Flournoy, Bocock, Bayly, Beale, Pendleton, Bedinger, Preston, Fulton, R. A. Thompson, Chapman, and McLane.

General Thomas Metcalf, Senator from Kentucky, was elected President; Mr. Gayle, of Alabama, first Vice President; and Mr. Atchison, of Missouri, second Vice President. Mr. Venable, of South Carolina, was chosen Secretary.

The President having taken the Chair, Mr. BAYLY of Virginia presented the following Preamble and Resolutions:

Resolved, That this meeting, composed of a portion of the Senators and Representatives from the slaveholding States, in the Congress of the United States, doth unequivocally express a firm determination to maintain and defend the Constitution of the United States against every aggression, and that they will support the Government of the United States in all measures warranted by that instrument.

That they most solemnly declare a warm attachment to the union of the States, agreeably to its obvious and real intention, as manifested by the Constitution of the United States and the history of its formation, to maintain which they pledge their individual honour; and that for this end it is their duty to watch over and oppose every infraction of these principles which constitute the only basis of that union; because a faithful observance of them can alone secure the existence and the blessings of Liberty to themselves and their posterity.

That the Government of the United States is one of delegated powers, limited by the plain sense and intention of the Constitution of the United States, which is the only legitimate source of them; and all powers not delegated by it to the General Government nor prohibited to the States are, by the express terms of the instrument, reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

That no authority is conferred by the Constitution of the United States, upon the Congress of the United States, to impair or destroy the right of property in Slaves either in the States, the District of Columbia, the Territories of the United States, or any other place whatever; nor to prohibit the transfer of Slaves from one place to another, except in the power delegated to it over the foreign Slave Trade, which has been exhausted.

That any act of Congress designed to impair or destroy the right of property in Slaves, in any of the places aforesaid, or to prohibit the transfer of Slaves from one part of the United States to another, would be a palpable and dangerous violation of the Constitution of the United States, and inconsistent with its compromises and guarantees, without which it could not have been adopted.

That the favour the late efforts made in the Congress of the United States and elsewhere to interfere with the subject of Domestic Slavery in the District of Columbia and the Territories of the United States and the transfer of slaves between different sections of the Union, have met with from a large portion of the people of the non-slaveholding States and their Representatives, is of the most alarming and dangerous character, and, if those efforts are persisted in, must inevitably lead to the dissolution of the union of these States.

That in view of the rapid strides with which those efforts have progressed of late years, in spite of argument and remonstrance on our part, we cannot be insensible to the mischief that is impending, or of the necessity of more effectual interposition, for the purpose of arresting the evil and maintaining the rights of the citizens of the slaveholding States.

That the fundamental principles of the Union is perfect equality of rights among States which compose it; that in legislating relative to the common property of all, to impose conditions and restrictions, in the enjoyment of it, upon the citizens of some of them which are not imposed upon the citizens of others, would place the former in a condition of inequality, inferiority, and degradation incompatible with that essential principle of the Union.

That a passage of a law of Congress, prohibiting the citizens of any of the States from residing, with such property as they possess, in territories of the United States acquired in a war waged with the common blood and treasure of all, would be to impose such conditions and restrictions to which it would be impossible for freemen, with honour to submit.

That in all cases of the character of the one in question, threatening the rights of the States and their citizens, where their Representatives in Congress have exhausted their power of resistance, in vain, it is for the States whose people are aggrieved to propose the mode of redress. But as we their Representatives near the theatre of action, see the extent of the danger, and feel it our duty to communicate it to our constituents; therefore—

Resolved further, That a Committee of one from each Slaveholding State be appointed to draw an address to the people of those States, setting forth the progress of the evil which in our opinion threatens them, and advising them to adopt prompt and efficient measures for the protection of the property of their citizens, the maintenance of the guarantees of the Constitution, their rights under them, and the union of the States.

On motion of Mr. STEPHENS, of Georgia, the resolutions were referred to a select Committee of one from each Slaveholding State to report to an adjourned meeting of the Senators and Representatives of the Slaveholding States, to be held in this chamber at 7 o'clock, the 15th of January, 1849.

On motion of Mr. Morse of Louisiana, it was

Resolved, That the aforesaid meeting on the 15th of January be advertised in the *Union* and *Intelligencer*, in this city.

The President appointed the following gentlemen as the special committee; Messrs. Stephens, Calhoun, Cabell, King, of Ala. Foote, Downs, Rusk, Sebastian, Atchison, of Mo. Moorehead, Clayton, Chapman, Bayly, Gentry and Venable.

Adjourned to meet at 7 P. M. 15th January, 1849.

A. W. VENABLE, Secretary.

ANTE-ROOM OF THE SENATE CHAMBER, Dec. 30.

At the call of the chairman of the Special Committee of one from each of the Slaveholding States appointed at the general meeting held in the Senate Chamber on the 23d December, 1848, the Committee assembled in the ante-room of the Senate Chamber. All of the committee were present but Mr. Cabell, who was sick, and Mr. Chapman, who was absent from the city. Mr. Stephens having expressed a desire that the committee should elect its own Chairman, he was, on motion, unanimously elected by the committee. On motion Mr. Venable was elected Secretary.

On motion of Mr. Calhoun, a Sub-Committe was appointed, to take into consideration the subject matter referred to the Special Committee; and the Chair appointed the said Committee, to wit: Messrs Calhoun, Clayton, King, Morehead, and Bayly, who were to signify to the Chairman of the General Committee when they were ready to report. The Committee adjourned to meet on the call of the Chairman.

ALEXANDER. H. STEPHENS, Chairman.
A. W. VENABLE, Secretary.

ANTE-ROOM OF THE SENATE CHAMBER, Jan. 10.

The Committee met. On the call of the Chairman, a quorum being present, Mr. CALHOUN, from the Sub-Committee, reported an Address to the people of the Slaveholding States, which was considered and discussed in Committee, who rose without coming to any conclusion thereon, and adjourned to meet on Saturday the 13th, at 10 o'clock, A. M.

ALEXANDER H. STEPHENS, Ch'n.
A. W. VENABLE, Sec'y.

ANTE-ROOM OF THE SENATE CHAMBER, Jan. 13.

The Committee met according to adjournment.—Present: Mr. Stephens, Chairman; Messrs. Cabell, Calhoun, Downs, Foote, Morehead, Atchison of Mo. Clayton, Chapman, Bayly, Venable, Rusk. Mr. King appeared by proxy, by Mr. Downs; and Mr. Sebastian by Mr. Foote.

Upon a statement of Mr. Downs and Mr. Foote that they were authorized, the Committee permitted them to vote for the aforesaid gentlemen.

The Address was further discussed and considered.

Whereupon Mr. CHAPMAN offered the following resolution:

Resolved, That in the opinion of this Committee, it is inexpedient at this time for any address to be published by the Representatives of the Slaveholding States, or that any action should be adopted apart from that of our proceedings in the respective Houses of Congress.

Which was decided in the negative.

The Yeas and Nays were demanded, and were as follows:

YEAS---Messrs. *Cabell, Clayton, Chapman, Gentry, Morehead*, Rusk and *Stephens*---7.

NAYS---Messrs. Atchison, Calhoun, Downs, Bayly, Foote, King of Ala. Stebastian and Venable---8. Whigs in *Italics*.

On motion of Mr. BAYLY, it was

Resolved, That Mr. Calhoun report the address which has been submitted to this Committee, to the meeting of the Southern members of Congress to be held in the Senate Chamber, January 16, 1849.

Which was decided in the affirmative.

The Yeas and Nays having been demanded, they were as follows:

YEAS---Messrs. Atchison, Bayly, Calhoun, Downs, Foote, King of Ala. Sebastian and Venable---8.

NAYS---Messrs. Stephens, (Chairman,) Chapman, Cabell, Clayton, Gentry, Morehead and Rusk---7.

Resolved, that the journal of the Committe be reported by the Chairman to the general meeting.

Adjourned. ALEXANDER H. STEPHENS, Ch'n.
A. W. VENABLE, Secretary.

SENATE CHAMBER, Jan. 15.

The Senators and Representatives of the Southern States met in the Senate Chamber, according to adjournment. The President, Mr. METCALF, took the Chair, and called the meeting to order.

OF THE SENATE---Present: Messrs. Clayton, Spruance, Pearce, R. Johnson, Mason, Hunter, Butler, Calhoun, H. V. Johnson, Berrien, Metcalf, Underwood, Turney, Bell, H. Johnson, Downs, Foote, Jefferson Davis, King, Fitzpatrick, Atchison, Westcott, Yulee, Rusk and Houston.

OF THE HOUSE---Present; Messrs. Chapman, Crisfield, Ligon, McLane, Roman, Atkinson, Bayly, Bedinger, Bocock, W. G. Brown, Flournoy, Fulton, Goggin, Meade, McDowell, Pendleton, Preston, R. Thompson, Barringer, Clingman, Daniel, McKay, Venable I. Holmes, Rhett, Simpson, Wallace, Woodward, H. Cobb, Haralson, Iverson, J. W. Jones, T. B. King, Lumpkin, Stephens, Toombs, W. R. W. Cobb, Gayle, Harris, Hilliard, G. S. Houston, Inge, A. G. Brown, Featherston, J. Thompson, Harmanson, La Sere, Morse, Morehead, Peyton, Barrow, Cocke, Crozier, Gentry, Haskell, H. W. Hill, Stanton, J. H. Thomas, Cabell, Kaufman, Pillsbury, Bowlin, R. W. Johnson.

Mr. HOUSTON of Texas offered the following resolution:

Resolved, That reporters of newspapers be permitted to occupy seats on this floor, and that the galleries be opened to spectators.

The Yeas and Nays being demanded, it was decided in the negative—Yeas 36, Nays 52.

Those who voted in the affirmative are:

Messrs. Clayton, Spruance, H. V. Johnson, Metcalf, Underwood, Bell, Rusk, S. Houston, Roman, Barringer, Clingman, H. Cobb, J. W. Jones, T. B. King, Lumpkin, Stephens, Toombs, Gayle, Hilliard, Tompkins, Boyd, Morehead, Barrow, Cocke, Crozier, Gentry, Haskell, Bowlin, Cabell, Kaufman, Pillsbury, Flournoy, Goggin, McDowell, Pendleton and Preston.

Those who voted in the negative are:

Messrs. Pearce, Johnson of Md. Mason, Hunter, Butler, Calhoun, Berrien, Turney, H. Johnson, Downs, Jefferson Davis, Foote, King, Fitzpatrick, Borland, Westcott, Yulee, Chapman, Crisfield, Ligon, McLane, Atchison, Bayly, Bedinger, Bocock, W. G. Brown, Fulton, Meade, R. A. Thompson, Daniel, McKay, Venable, I. Holmes, Rhett, Wallace, Woodward, Simpson, Haralson, Iverson, W. R. W. Cobb, Harris, Inge, A. G. Brown, Featherston, J. Thompson, Harmanson, Morse, La Sere, Peyton, Stanton Thomas, R. Johnson.

The rules of the Senate were adopted by the meeting.

Mr. STEPHENS, (Chairman of the Select Committee of Fifteen,) made a report by submitting the journals of the Committee; which was ordered to be inserted in the journal and printed.

Mr. CALHOUN, from the Committee of Fifteen, reported the following address, which was read by the Secretary.

THE ADDRESS OF THE SOUTHERN DELEGATES IN CONGRESS TO THEIR CONSTITUENTS.

We, whose names are hereunto annexed, address you in discharge of what we believe to be a solemn duty, on the most important subject ever presented for your consideration. We allude to the conflict between the two great sections of the Union, growing out of a difference of feeling and opinion in reference to the relation existing between the two races, the European and African, which inhabit the Southern section, and the acts of aggression and encroachment to which it has led.

The conflict commenced not long after the acknowledgment of our independence, and has gradually increased until it has arrayed the great body of the North against the South on this most vital subject. In the progress of this conflict, aggression has followed aggression, and encroachment encroachment until they have reached a point when a regard for your peace and safety will not permit us to remain longer silent. The object of this address is to give you a clear, correct, but brief account of the whole series of aggression and encroachments on your rights, with a statement of the dangers to which they expose you. Our object in making it is not to cause excitement, but to put you in the possession of all the facts and circumstances necessary to a full and just conception of a deep-seated disease, which threatens great danger to you and the whole body politic. We act on the impression, that in a popular Government like ours, a true conception of the actual character and state of a disease is indispensable to effecting a cure.

We have made it a joint address, because we believe that the magnitude of the subject required that it should assume the most impressive and solemn form.

Not to go farther back, the difference of opinion and feeling in reference to the relation between the two races disclosed itself in the Convention that framed the Constitution, and constituted one of the greatest difficulties in forming it. After many efforts, it was overcome by a compromise, which provided, in the first place, that representatives and direct taxes shall be apportioned among the States according to their respective numbers; and that, in ascertaining the number of each, five slaves shall be estimated as three. In the next, that slaves escaping into States where Slavery does not exist, shall not be discharged from servitude, but shall be delivered up on claim of the party to whom their labour or service is due. In the third place, that Congress shall not prohibit the importation of slaves before the year 1808; but a tax not exceeding ten dollars may be imposed on each imported. And finally, that no capitation or direct tax shall be laid, but in proportion to federal numbers; and that no amendment of the Constitution, prior to 1808, shall affect this provision, nor that relating to the importation of slaves.

So satisfactory were these provisions, that the second, relative to the delivering up of fugitive slaves, was adopted unanimously, and all the rest, except the third, relative to the importation of slaves until 1808, with almost equal unanimity. They recognize the existence of Slavery, and make a specific provision for its protection where it was supposed to be the most exposed. They go farther, and incorporate it, as an important element. In determining the relative weight of the several States in the Government of the Union, and the respective burden they should bear in laying capitation and direct taxes.—It was well understood at the time, that, without them the Constitution would not have been adopted by the Southern States, and, of course, that they constituted elements so essential to the system that it never would have existed without them. The Northern States, knowing all this, ratified the Constitution, thereby pledging their faith, in the most solemn manner, sacredly to observe them. How that faith has been kept, and that pledge redeemed we shall next proceed to show.

With few exceptions of no great importance, the South had no cause to complain prior to the year 1819—a year, it is to be feared, destined to mark a train of events, bringing with them many, and great, and fatal disasters, on the country and its institutions. With it commenced the agitating debate on the question of the admission of Missouri into the Union. We shall pass by for the present this question, and others of the same kind directly growing out of it, and shall proceed to consider the effect of that spirit of discord which it roused up between the two sections. It first disclosed itself in the North, by hostility to that portion of the Constitution which provides for the delivering up of fugitive slaves. In its progress it led to the adoption of hostile acts, intended to render it of non-effect, and with so much success that it may be regarded now as practically expunged from the Constitution. How this has been effected will be next explained.

After a careful examination, truth constrains us to say, that it has been by a clear and palpable evasion of the Constitution. It is impossible for any provision to be more free from ambiguity or doubt. It is in the following words:

"No person held to service, or labour, in one State, under the laws thereof, escaping into another State, shall, in consequence of any law of regulation therein, be discharged from such service or labour, but shall be delivered up on claim of the party to whom such service or labour may be due."

All is clear. There is not an uncertain or equivocal word to be found in the whole provision. What shall not be done, and what shall be done, are fully and explicitly set forth. The former provides that the fugitive slave shall not be discharged from his servitude by any law or regulation of the State wherein he is bound; and the latter, that he shall be delivered up on claim of his owner.

We do not deem it necessary to undertake to refute the sophistry and subterfuges by which so plain a provision of the Constitution has been evaded, and in effect, annulled. It constitutes an essential part of the constitutional compact, and of course of the supreme law of the land. As such, it is binding on all the Federal and State Governments, the States and the individuals composing them. The sacred obligation of compact, and the solemn injunction of the supreme law, which legislators and judges, both Federal and State, are bound by oath to support, all unite to enforce its fulfilment, according to its plain meaning and true intent. What that meaning and intent are, there was no diversity of opinion in the better days of the Republic, prior to 1819. Congress, State Legislatures, State and Federal Judges and Magistrates, and People, all spontaneously placed the same interpretation on it. During that period none interposed impediments in the way of the owner seeking to recover his fugitive slave; nor did any deny his right to have every proper facility to enforce his claim to have him delivered up. It was then nearly as easy to recover one found in a Northern State as one found in a neighbouring Southern State. But this has passed away, and the provision is defunct, except perhaps in two States.*

When we take into consideration the importance and clearness of this provision, the evasion by which it has been set aside may fairly be regarded as one of the most fatal blows ever received by the South and the Union. This cannot be more concisely and correctly stated than it has been by one of the learned judges of the Supreme Court of the United States. In one of his decisions† Judge Story said:

"Historically, it is well known that the object of the clause was to secure to the citizens of the slaveholding States the complete right and title of ownership in their slaves, as property, in every State of the Union, into which they might escape from the State wherein they were held in servitude." . . . "The full recognition of this right and title was indispensable to the security of this species of property in all the slaveholding States, and indeed, was so vital to the preservation of their interests and institutions, that it cannot be doubted that it constituted a fundamental article without the adoption of which the Union would not have been formed. Its true design was to guard against the doctrines and principles prevalent in the non-slaveholding States, by preventing them from intermeddling with, or restricting, or abolishing the rights of the owners of slaves."

Again:

"The clause was therefore of the last importance to the safety and security of the Southern States, and could not be surrendered by them without endangering the whole property in slaves. The clause was accordingly adopted in the constitution, by the unanimous consent of the framers of it—a proof at once of its intrinsic and practical necessity."

Again:

"The clause manifestly contemplates the existence of a positive, unqualified right on the part of the owner of the slave, which no State law or regulation can in any way regulate, control, qualify, or restrain."

The opinion of the other learned Judges was not less emphatic as to the importance of this provision and the unquestionable right of the South under it. Judge Baldwin, in charging the jury said:‡

"If there are any rights of property which can be enforced—if one citizen have any rights of property which are inviolable under the protection of the supreme law of the State, and the Union, they are those which have been set at nought by some of these defendants. As the owner of property, which he had a perfect right to possess, protect, and take away—as a citizen of a sister State, entitled to all the privileges and immunities of citizens of any other States—Mr Johnson stands aside before you on ground which cannot be taken from under him—it is the same ground on which the Government itself is based. If the defendants can be justified, we have no longer law or Government."

Again, after referring more particularly to this provision for delivering up fugitive slaves, he said:

"Thus you see that the foundations of the Government are laid, and rest, on the right of property in slaves. The whole structure must fall by disturbing the corner stones."

These are grave, and solemn, and admonitory words, from a high source. They confirm all for which the South has ever contended, as to the clearness, importance and fundamental character of this provision, and the disastrous consequences which inevitably follow from its violation. But in spite of these solemn warnings, the violation then commenced, and which they were intended to rebuke, has been fully and perfectly consummated. The citizens of the South, in their attempt to recover their slaves, now meet, instead of aid and coöperation, resistance in every form; resistance from hostile acts of legislation, intended to baffle and defeat their claims by all sorts of devices, and by interposing every description of impediment—resistance from judges and magistrates—and finally, when all these fail, from mobs, composed of whites and blacks, which, by threats or force, rescue the fugitive slave from the possession of his rightful owner. The attempt to recover a slave, in most of the Northern States, cannot now be made without the hazard of insult, heavy pecuniary loss, imprisonment, and even of life itself. Already has a worthy citizen of Maryland‖ lost his life in making an attempt to enforce his claim to a fugitive slave under this provision.

But a provision of the Constitution may be violated indirectly as well as directly, by doing an act in its nature inconsistent with that which is enjoined to be done. Of this form of violation there is a striking instance connected with the provision under consideration. We alluded to secret associations which are believed to exist in many of the Northern States, whose object is to entice, decoy, entrap, inveigle, and seduce slaves to escape from their owners, and to pass them secretly and rapidly, by means organized for the purpose, into Canada, where they will be beyond the reach of the provision. That to entice a slave, by whatever artifice, to abscond from his owner into a non-slaveholding State, with the intention to place him beyond the reach of the provision or prevent his recovery, by concealment or otherwise, is as completely repugnant to it as its open violation would be, is too clear to admit of doubt or to require illustration. And yet, as repugnant as these combinations are to the true intent of the provision, it is believed that, with the above exception, not one of the States within whose limits they exist, has adopted any measures to suppress them, or to punish those by whose agency the object for which they were formed is carried into execution. On the contrary, they have looked on and witnessed with indifference, if not with secret approbation, a great number of slaves enticed from their owners and placed beyond the possibility of recovery, to the great annoyance and heavy pecuniary loss of the bordering Southern States.

When we take into consideration the great importance of this provision, the absence of all uncertainty as to its true meaning and intent, the many guards by which it is surrounded to protect and enforce it, and then reflect how completely the object for which it was inserted in the Constitution is defeated by these two-fold infractions, we doubt, taking all together, whether a more flagrant breach of faith is to be found on record. We know the language we have used is strong, but it is not less true than strong.

There remains to be noticed another class of aggressive acts of a kindred character, but which, instead of striking at an express and specific provision of the Constitution, aims directly at destroying the relation between the two races at the South, by means subversive to their tendency of one of the ends for which the Constitution was established.—We refer to the systematic agitation of the question by the Abolitionists; which, commencing about 1835, is still continued in all possible forms. Their avowed intention is to bring about a state of things that will force emancipation on the South. To unite the North in fixed hostility to Slavery in the South, and to excite discontent among the slaves with their condition, are among the means employed to effect it. With a view to bring about the former, every means are resorted to in order to render the South, and the relation between the two races there, odious and hateful to the North.

For this purpose societies and newspapers are every where established, debating clubs opened, lecturers employed, pamphlets and other publications, pictures and petitions to Congress resorted to, and directed to that single point, regardless of truth or decency, while the circulation of incendiary publications in the South, the agitation of the subject of Abolition in Congress, and the employment of emissaries are relied on to excite discontent among the slaves. This agitation, and the use of these means, have been continued, with more or less activity for a series of years, not without doing much toward effecting the object intended. We regard both object and means to be aggressive and dangerous to the rights of the South, and subversive, as stated, of one of the ends for which the Constitution was established. Slavery is a domestic institution. It belongs to the States, each for itself, to decide whether it shall be established or not; and, if it be established, whether it should be abolished or not. Such being the clear and unquestionable right of the States, it follows necessarily that it would be a flagrant act of aggression on a State, destructive of its rights, and subversive of its independence, for the Federal Government, or one or more States, or their people, to undertake to force on it the emancipation of its slaves.

But it is a sound maxim in politics, as well as law and morals, that no one has the right to do that indirectly which he cannot do directly, and it may be added with equal truth, to aid, to abet, or countenance another in doing it. And yet, the Abolitionists of the North, openly avowing the intention, and resorting to the most efficient means for the purpose, have been attempting to bring about a state of things to force the Southern states to emancipate their slaves, without any act on the part of the Northern States to arrest or suppress the means by which they propose to accomplish it. They have been permitted to pursue their object, and to use whatever means they please; if without aid or countenance, also without resistance of disapprobation. What gives a deeper shade to the whole affair is the fact, that one of the means to effect their object, that of exciting discontent among our slaves, tends directly to subvert what its preamble declares to be one of the ends for which the Constitution was ordained and established—"to insure domestic tranquility"—and that in the only way in which domestic tranquility is likely ever to be disturbed in the South.

Certain it is, that an agitation so systematic—having such an object in view, and sought to be carried into execution by such means—would, between independent nations, constitute just cause of remonstrance by the party against which the aggression was directed, and, if not heeded, an appeal to arms for redress. Such being the case where an aggression of the kind takes place among independent nations, how much more aggravated must it be between confederated States, where the Union precludes an appeal to arms, while it affords a medium through which it can operate with vastly increased force and effect? That it would be perverted to such a use, never entered into the imagination of the generation which formed and adopted the Constitution; and, if it had been supposed it would, it is certain that the South never would have adopted it.

We now return to the question of the admission of Missouri into the Union, and shall proceed to give a brief sketch of the occurrences connected with it, and the consequence to which it has directly led. In the latter part of 1819 the then territory of Missouri applied to Congress, in the usual form, for leave to form a State constitution and government, in order to be admitted into the Union. A bill was reported for the purpose, with the usual provisions in such cases. Amendments were offered, having for their object to make it a condition of her admission, that her constitution should have a provision to prohibit Slavery. This brought on the agitating debate which, with the effects that followed, has done so much to alienate the South and North, and endanger our political institutions. Those who objected to the amendments rested their opposition on the high grounds of the right of self-government.—They claimed that a territory having reached the period when it is proper for it to form a constitution, and government for itself, becomes fully vested with all the rights of self-government; and that even the condition imposed on it by the Federal Constitution, relates not to the formation of its constitution and government, but its admission into the Union. For that purpose it provides as a condition, that the government must be republican.

They claimed that that Congress has no right to add to this condition, and that to assume it would be tantamount to the assumption of the right to make its entire constitution and government; as no limitation could be imposed, as to the extent of the right, if it be admitted that it exists at all. Those who supported the amendment denied these grounds, and claimed the right of Congress to impose, at discretion, what conditions it pleased. In this agitating debate, the two sections stood arrayed against each other; the South in favour of the bill without amendment, and the North opposed to it without it. The debate and agitation continued until the session was well advanced; but it became apparent toward its close, that the people of Missouri were fixed and resolved in their opposition to the proposed condition, and that they would certainly reject it, and adopt a constitution without it, should the bill pass with the condition.

Such being the case, it required no great effort of mind to perceive that Missouri, once in possession of a constitution and government, not simply on paper, but with legislators elected, and officers appointed, to carry them into effect, the grave questions would be presented, whether she was of right a State or Territory; and if the latter, whether Congress had the right, and if the right, the power, to abrogate her constitution, disperse her legislature, and to remand her back to the territorial condition. These were great, and, under the circumstances, fearful questions—too fearful to be met by those who had raised the agitation. From that time the only question was, how to escape the difficulty. Fortunately, a means was afforded. A compromise (as it was called) was offered, based on the terms, that the North should cease to oppose the admission of Missouri on the grounds for which the South contended, and that the provisions of the ordinance of 1787, for the government of the North-western Territory, should be applied to all the territory acquired by the United States from France, under the treaty of Louisiana, lying north of 36 degress 30 minutes except the portion lying in the State of Missouri. The northern members embraced it; and although not originating with them, adopted it as their own. It was forced through Congress, by the almost united votes of the North, against a minority consisting almost entirely of members from the Southern States.

Such was the termination of this, the first conflict, under the Constitution, between the two sections, in reference to Slavery in connection with the Territories. Many hailed it as a permanent and final adjustment that would prevent the recurrence of similar conflicts; but others, less sanguine, took the opposite and more gloomy view, regarding it as the precursor of a train of events which might rend the Union asunder, and prostrate our political system. One of these was the experienced and sagacious Jefferson. Thus far time would seem to favour his forebodings. May a returning sense of justice, and a protecting Providence, avert their final fulfilment.

For many years the subject of Slavery in reference to the Territories ceased to agitate the country. Indications, however, connected with the question of annexing Texas, showed clearly that it was ready to break out again, with redoubled violence, on some future occasion. The difference in the case of Texas was adjusted by extending the Missouri compromise line of 35 30, from its terminus, on the western boundary of the Louisiana purchase, to the western boundary of Texas. The agitation again ceased for a short period.

The war with Mexico soon followed, and that terminated in the acquisition of New Mexico and Upper California, embracing an area equal to about one-half of the entire valley of the Mississippi. If to this we add the portion of Oregon acknowledged to be ours by the recent Treaty with England, our whole Territory on the Pacific and West of the Rocky Mountains, will be found to be in extent but little less than that vast valley. The near prospect of so great an addition rekindled the excitement between the North and South in reference to Slavery in its connection with Territories, which has become, since those on the Pacific were acquired, more universal and intense than ever.

The effects have been to widen the difference between the two sections, and to give a more determined and hostile character to their conflict. The North no longer respects the Missouri Compromise line, although adopted by their almost unanimous vote. Instead of compromise they avow that their determination is to exclude Slavery from all the Territories of the United States acquired or to be acquired, and of course to prevent the citizens of the Southern States from emigrating with their property in slaves to any of them. Their object, they allege is to prevent the extension of Slavery, and ours to extend it, thus making the issue between them and us to be the naked question—Shall Slavery be extended or not? We do not deem it necessary, looking to the objects of this address, to examine the question so fully discussed at the last Session, whether Congress has the right to exclude the citizens of the South from emigrating with their property into Territories belonging to the confederated States of the Union. What we propose in this connection is, to make a few remarks on what the North alleges, erroneously, to be the issue between us and them.

So far from maintaining the doctrine which the issue implies, we hold that the Federal Government has no right to extend or restrict Slavery, no more then to establish or abolish it; nor has it any right whatever to distinguish between the domestic institutions of one State or section and another, in order to favour the one and discourage the other.—As the Federal representative of each and all the States, it is bound to deal out, within the sphere of its powers, equal and exact justice and favour to all. To act otherwise, to undertake to discriminate between the domestic institutions of one and another, would be to act as total subversion of the end for which it was established—to be the common protector and guardian of all. Entertaining these opinions, we ask not, as the North alleges we do, for the extension of Slavery. That would make a discrimination in our favour as unjust and unconstitutional as the discrimination they ask against us in their favour. It is not for them nor for the Federal Government to determine whether our domestic institution is good or bad, or whether it should be repressed or preserved. It belongs to us, and us only, to decide such questions. What, then, we do insist on, is, not to extend Slavery, but that we shall not be prohibited from immigrating, with our property, into the Territories of the United States, because we are Slaveholders; or, in other words; that we shall not on that account be disfranchised of a privilege possessed by all others, citizens and foreigners without discrimination as to character, profession, or colour. All, whether savage, barbarian or civilized, may freely enter and remain; we only being excluded.

We rest our claim not only on the high grounds above stated, but also on the solid foundation of right, justice, and equality. The territories immediately in controversy—New Mexico and California—were acquired by the common sacrifice and efforts of all the States, toward which the South contributed far more than her full share of men,* to say nothing of money, and is, of course, on every principle of right, justice, fairness and equality, entitled to participate fully in the benefits to be derived from their acquisition. But as impregnable as is this ground, there is another not less so. Ours is a Federal Government—a Government in which not individuals but States, as distinct sovereign communities are the constituents. To them, as members of the Federal Union, the Territories belong; and they are hence declared to be Territories belonging to the United States. The States, then, are the joint owners. Now, it is conceded by all writers on the subject, that in all such Governments their members are all equal—equal in rights and equal in dignity. They also concede that this equality constitutes the basis of such Government, and that it cannot be destroyed without changing their nature and character. To deprive, then, the Southern States and their citizens of their full share in Territories declared to belong to them in common with the other States would be in derogation of the equality belonging to them as members of a federal Union, and sink them, from being equals, into a subordinate and dependent condition. Such are the solid and impregnable grounds on which we rest our demand to an equal participation in the Territories.

But as solid and impregnable as they are in the eyes of justice and reason, they oppose a feeble resistance to a majority determined to engross the whole. At the last Session of Congress, a bill was passed establishing a Territoral Government for Oregon, excluding Slavery therefrom. The President gave his sanction to the bill and sent a Special Message to Congress assigning his reasons for doing so. These reasons presupposed that the Missouri Compromise was to be, and would be, extended west of the Rocky Mountains to the Pacific Ocean. And the President intimated his intention in his message to veto any future bill that should restrict Slavery south of the line of that compromise. Assuming it to have been the purpose and intention of the North to extend the Missouri Compromise line as above indicated, the passage of the Oregon bill could only be regarded as evincing the acquiescence of the South in that line. But the developements of the present Session of Congress have made it manifest to all that no such purpose or intention now exists with the North to any considerable extent. Of the truth of this, we have ample evidence in what has occurred already in the House of Representatives, where the popular feelings are soonest and most intensely felt.

Although Congress has been in session but little more than one month, a greater number of measures of an aggressive character have been introduced, and they more aggravated and dangerous than have been for years before. And what clearly discloses whence they take their origin, is the fact that they all relate to the Territorial aspect of the subject of Slavery, or some other of a nature and character intimately connected with it.

The first of this series of aggressions is a resolution introduced by a member from Massachusetts, the object of which is to repeal all acts or parts of acts, which recognize the existence of Slavery, or authorize the selling and disposing of slaves in this District. On question of leave to bring in a bill, the votes stood 69 for and 82 against leave. The next was a resolution offered by a member from Ohio, instructing the Committee on Territories to report forthwith bills for excluding Slavery from California and New-Mexico.† It passed by a vote of 107 to 80. That was followed by a bill introduced by another member from Ohio, to take the votes of the inhabitants of this District on the question whether Slavery within its limits should be abolished.

The bill provided, according to the admission of the mover, that free negroes and slaves should vote. On the question to lay the bill on the table, the votes stood—for, 106; against, 79. To this succeeded the resolution of a member from New-York, in the following words:

"*Whereas* the traffic now prosecuted in this metropolis of the Republic in human beings, as chattels, is contrary to natural justice and the fundamental principles of our political system, and is notoriously a reproach to our country, throughout Christendom, and a serious hindrance to the progress of Republican liberty among the nations of the earth. Therefore,

"*Resolved*, That the Committee for the District of Columbia be instructed to report a bill, as soon as practicable prohibiting the Slave-Trade in said District."

On the question of adopting the resolution, the votes stood 98, for, and 88 against. He was followed by a member from Illinois, who offered a resolution for abolishing Slavery in the Territories, and all places where Congress has exclusive powers of legislation; that is, in all forts, magazines, arsenals, dock-yards, and other needful buildings, purchased by Congress with the consent of the legislature of the State.

This resolution was passed under the rules of the House without being put to vote.

The votes in favour of all these measures were confined to the members of the Northern States.—True, there are some patriotic members from that section who voted against all of them, and whose high sense of justice is duly appreciated; who in the progress of the aggressions of the South have, by their votes sustained the guarantees of the Constitution, and in whose fidelity to say many have been sacrificed at home by their patriotic course.

We have now brought to a close a narrative of the series of acts of aggression and encroachments connected with the subject of this address, including those that are consummated and those still in progress. They are numerous, great and dangerous, and threaten with destruction the greatest and most vital of all the interests and institutions of the South. Indeed, it may be doubted whether there is a single provision, stipulation or guaranty of the Constitution, intended for the security of the South, that has not been rendered almost nugatory. It may even be made a serious question whether the encroachments already made, without the aid of any other, would not, if permitted to operate unchecked, end in emancipation, and that at no distant day. But be that as it may, it hardly admits of a doubt that, if the aggressions already commenced in the House, and now in progress, should be consummated, such in the end would certainly be the consequence.

Little, in truth, would be left to be done after we have been excluded from all the Territories, including all to be hereafter acquired; after Slavery is abolished in this District and in the numerous places dispersed all over the South, where Congress has exclusive right of legislation, and after the other measures proposed are consummated. Every outwork would be carried, the citadel itself left to be the common prey of Northern assailants, free; unless there should be some positive enactments to prevent it.

Under such a state of things the probability is, that emancipation would soon follow, without any final act to abolish Slavery. The depressing effect of such measures on the white race at the South, and the hope they create in the black of a speedy, emancipation would produce a state of feeling inconsistent with the much longer continuance of the existing relations between the two. But be that as it may, it is certain, if emancipation did not follow as a matter of course, the final act in the States would not be long delayed. The want of constitutional power would oppose a feeble resistance.—The great body of the North is united against our peculiar institution. Many believe it to be sinful, and the residue, with inconsiderable exceptions, believe it to be wrong. Such being the case, it would indicate a very superficial knowledge of human nature, to think that after aiming at abolition systematically for so many years, and pursuing it with such unscrupulous disregard of law and constitution, the fanatics who have led the way and forced the great body of the North to follow them, would, when the the finishing stroke only remained to be given voluntarily suspend it, permit any constitutional scruples or considerations of justice to arrest it. To these may be added an aggression, though not yet commenced, long meditated and threatened—to prohibit what the Abolitionists call the internal Slave-Trade, meaning thereby the transfer of slaves from one State to another, from whatever motive done, or however effected. Their object would seem to be to render them worthless by crowding them together where they are, and thus hasten the work of emancipation. There is reason for believing that it it will soon follow those now in progress, unless, indeed, some decisive step should be taken in the meantime to arrest the whole.

The question then is, Will the the aggression proposed in the House be adopted?

They may not, and probably will not be this session. But when we take into consideration that there is a majority now in favour of one of them, and a strong minority now in favour of the other, as far as the sense of the House has been taken; that there will be in all probability a considerable increase in the next Congress of the vote in favour

trolled by the dominant power of the Northern States of the Confederacy, against the resistance and struggle of the Southern.

It can then only be effected by the prostration of the white race; and that would necessarily engender the bitterest feelings of hostility between them and the North. But the reverse would be the case between the blacks of the South and the people of the North. Owing their emancipation to them they would regard them as friends, guardians and patrons, and center, accordingly, all their sympathy in them. The people of the North would not fail to reciprocate and to favour them, instead of the whites.—Under the influence of such feelings, and impelled by fanaticism and love of power, they would not stop at emancipation. Another step would be taken—to raise them to a political and social equality with their former owners, by giving them the right of voting and holding public offices under the Federal Government. We see the first step toward it in the bill already alluded to—to vest the free blacks and slaves with the right to vote on the question of emancipation in this District. But when once raised on an equality, they would become the fast political associates of the North, acting and voting with them on all questions, and by this political union between them, holding the white race at the South in complete subjection.

The blacks, and the profligate whites that might unite with them, would become the principal recipients of Federal offices and patronage, and would, in consequence, be raised above the whites of the South in the political and social scale. We would, in a word, change conditions with them—a greater degradation than has ever yet fallen to the lot of a free and enlightened people, and one from which we could not escape, should emancipation take place, (which it certainly will if not prevented,) but by fleeing the homes of ourselves and our ancestors, and by abandoning our country to our former slaves, to become the permanent abode of disorder, anarchy, poverty, misery and wretchedness.

With such a prospect before us, the gravest and most solemn question that ever claimed the attention of a people is presented for your consideration:—What is to be done to prevent it? It is a question belonging to you to decide. All we propose is to give you our opinion.

We, then, are of the opinion that the first and indispensable step, without which nothing can be done, and with which everything may be, is to be united among yourselves, on this great and most vital question. The want of Union and concert in reference to it has brought the South, the Union, and our system of Government to their present perilous condition. Instead of placing it above all others, it has been made subordinate, not only to mere questions of policy, but to the preservation of party ties and ensuring of party success, as high as we hold a due respect for these, we hold them subordinate to that and other questions involving our safety and happiness. Until they are so held by the South, the North will not believe that you are in earnest in opposition to their encroachments, and they will continue to follow, one after another, until the work of abolition is finished. To convince them that you are, you must prove by your acts that you hold all other questions subordinate to it. If you become united, and prove yourselves in earnest; the North will be brought to a pause, and to a calculation of consequences; and that may lead to a change of measures and the adoption of a course of policy that may quietly and peaceably terminate this long conflict between the two sections. If it should not, nothing would remain for you but to stand up immovably in defence of rights, involving your all—your property, prosperity, equality, liberty, and safety.

As the assailed, you would stand justified by all laws, human and divine, in repelling a blow so dangerous, without looking to consequences, and to resort to all means necessary for that purpose. Your assailants, and not you, would be responsible for consequences.

Entertaining these opinions, we earnestly entreat you *to be united*, and for that purpose adopt all necessary measures. Beyond this, we think it would not be proper to go at present.

We hope, if you should unite with anything like unanimity, it may of itself apply a remedy to this deep-seated and dangerous disease; but, if such not be the case, the time will then have come for you to decide what course to adopt.

Mr. CLAYTON moved to lay the whole subject on the table. The Yeas and Nays being demanded, the motion was rejected—Yeas 28, Nays 60.

Those who voted in the affirmative are:

Messrs. Clayton, Spruance, Pearce, R. Johnson, Metcalfe, Underwood, Bell, Chapman, Crisfield, Roman, Goggin, Clingman, T. B. King, Barringer, Stephens, Toombs, Morehead, Barrow, Cocke, Crozier, Gentry, Haskell, Cabell, Flournoy, and Preston—28—all Whigs.

Those who voted in the negative are:

Messrs. Mason, Hunter, Butler, Calhoun, Downs, Turney, Atchison, Davis, Foote, King, Borland, Westcott, Yulee, Rusk, S. Houston, Ligon, McLane, Atkinson, Bayly, Bedinger, Bocock, W. G. Brown, Meade, McDowell, *Fulton*, R. A. Thompson, McKay, Daniel, *Pendleton*, I. Holmes, Rhett, Simpson, Wallace, Woodward, H. Cobb, Haralson, Iverson, *J. W. Jones*, Lumpkin, W. R. W. Cobb, *Gayle*, Harris, A. G. Brown, Featherston, Jacob Thompson, *Tompkins, Hilliard*, Harmonson, Morse, La Sere, Boyd, Peyton, Hill, Stanton, Thomas, Kaufman, Pillsbury, Bowlin, R. W. Johnson, H. V. Johnson, *Berrien*, and Venable—60—Whigs in *Italics*.

Mr. BERRIEN moved to recommit the address to the Committee with instructions.

Mr. MCLANE moved to divide the proposition which was done, and the address was recommended without instructions.

The Yeas and Nays being demanded, were as follows: Yeas 41, Nays 40.

Those who voted in the affirmative are:

Messrs. Clayton, Spruance, Pearce, R. Johnson, Metcalfe, Berrien, Underwood, Rusk, Houston, Chapman, Crisfield Ligon, McLane, Roman, Flournoy, Fulton, Goggin, McDowell, Pendleton, Preston, Barringer, Clingman, McKay, H. Cobb, J. W. Jones, T. B. King, Lumpkin, Stephens, Toombs, Hilliard, Boyd, Morehead, Barrow, Cocke, Crozier, Gentry, Haskell, Cabell, Thomas, Pillsbury, and Kaufman—41.

Those who voted in the negative are:

Messrs. Mason, Hunter, Butler, Calhoun, H. Johnson, Turney, Downs, J. Davis, Foote, W. R. King, Atchison, Borland, Westcott, Yulee, Atkinson, Bayly, Bocock, Bedinger, W. G. Brown, Meade, R. Thompson Venable, Daniel, I. Holmes, Rhett, Simpson, Wallace, Woodward, Haralson, Iverson Gayle, Harris, A. G. Brown, Harmanson, Moore, La Sere, Peyton, Hill, Stanton, and R. W. Johnson—40.

Mr. STEPHENS moved that this meeting adjourn *sine die*. The Yeas and Nays being demanded, it, was decided in the negative—Yeas 20, Nays 59.

Those who voted in the affirmative are:

Messrs. Clayton, Spruance, Pearce, R. Johnson Underwood. Metcalfe, Bell, Chapman, Crisfield, Roman, Goggin, T. B. King, Stephens, Toombs, Morehead, Barrow, Cocke, Crozier, Gentry, Haskell and Preston—20. All Whigs.

Those who voted in the negative are:

Messrs. Mason, Hunter, Butler, Calhoun, *H. Johnson, Berrien*, Turney, Downs, Foote, Davis, King, Borland, Yulee, Westcott, Rusk, S. Houston, Atkinson, Bayly, Bedinger, Bocock, W. G. Brown, *Flournoy, Fulton*, Meade, McDowell, *Pendleton*, R. A. Thompson, *Barringer, Clingman*, McKay Venable, Daniel, I Holmes, Rhett, Simpson, Wallace, Woodward, Haralson, Iverson, *J. W. Jones, Gayle*, Harris, *Hilliard*, A. G Brown, Jacob Thompson, *Tompkins*, Harmonson, Morse, La Sere, Boyd, Peyton, Hill, Stanton, Thomas, *Cabell*, Kaufman, Pillsbury, Bowlin and *R. Johnson*—59. Whigs in *Italics*.

Mr. STEPHENS, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. RUSK and Mr. MOREHEAD requested to be excused from serving on the Committee, which was granted.

The Chair appointed in the place of Mr. Stephens Mr. Berrien, in the place of Mr. Morehead Mr. Peyton, in the place of Mr. Rusk Mr. Kaufman, and in the place of Mr. Chapman Mr. Pearce.

The meeting then adjourned, to meet in the Senate Chamber on Monday evening, the 22d, at 7 o'clock.

A. W. VENABLE, Secretary.

ANTE-ROOM OF THE SENATE CHAMBER, Jan. 18.

The Select Committee of fifteen from the slaveholding States met at 10 o'clock, and was organized by calling Mr. KING, of Alabama, to the Chair.

Present: Mr Kaufman in place of Mr. Rusk, excused, Mr. Berrien in place of Mr. Stephens, excused, Mr. King, Mr. Gentry, Mr. Bayly Mr. Venable, Mr. Atchison, Mr. Sebastian, Mr. Downs, Mr. Calhoun Mr. Cabell, Absent: Mr. Pearce, Mr. Clayton, Mr. Foote, and Mr. Peyton

Mr. BERRIEN submitted a resolution to change the title of the address reported to the general meeting, to an address by the individuals composing the meeting to the People of the United States.

The Yeas and Nays being demanded, it was carried—Yeas 7, Nays 4, as follows:

YEAS—Messrs. *Cabell*, Kaufman, King, *Berrien, Gentry*, Sebastian and Downs—7.

NAYS—Messrs. Bayly, Atchison, Venable, and Calhoun—4. Whigs in *Italics*.

Mr. BERRIEN submitted a resolution to refer the address to a Sub Committee of five, to report to an adjourned meeting of the Select Committee, to meet in the anteroom of the Senate chamber at 6 o'clock P M. on Saturday next.

The Yeas and Nays being demanded, it was carried in the affirmative—Yeas 7, Nays 4, as follows:

YEAS—Messrs. *Cabell*, Kaufman, King, *Berrien, Gentry*, Sebastian and Downs—7.

NAYS—Messrs. Bayly, Atchison, Venable and Calhoun—4.

The Chair appointed the Committee as follows:

Messrs Berrien, Bayly Cabell, Atchison and Calhoun.

A. W. VENABLE, Secretary.

ANTE-ROOM OF THE SENATE CHAMBER, Jan. 20.

The Committee met at the call of the Chairman. A quorum being present,

Mr. BERRIEN, Sub-Committee, read an Address, which was ordered to be reported to the General Meeting as a substitute for the address recommitted to this Committee. Adjourned.

A. W. VENABLE, Secretary.

SENATE CHAMBER, January 22.

The Southern Senators and Members of the House of Representatives met in the Senate Chamber according to adjournment. The President called the meeting to order at 7 o'clock, P. M.

Mr. KING, Chairman of the Committee of fifteen, reported an Address to the people of the United States, which the Committee recommended as substitute for the Address which was read at the last meeting. The Address was read by Mr. Berrien, Chairman of the Sub-Committee.

[We should be glad to publish the Address of Mr. Berrien, but the crowded state of our columns absolutely forbids. Mr. B's address is not quite so long as the one adopted, and though addressed "to the People of the United States," instead of the people of the South, it is in many respects similar to the one put forth, both in sentiments and words, still they differ in many particulars. The rejected Address concludes as follows:

We have done. Our desire has been to place before the American people the facts necessary to enable *them* to stay this controversy—to exercise the restraining influence which they alone possess, to give harmony to our counsels, and prosperity to our country. We, too, constitute a portion of that People; and speedily resuming our places among them, will unite our efforts for the accomplishment of this beneficent result.]

Mr. STEPHENS submitted the following resolution:

Resolved, That it is inexpedient at this time for any Address to be published by the Representatives of the slaveholding states, or that any action should be adopted apart from our proceedings in the respective Houses of Congress.

Mr. BAYLY moved to lay this resolution on the table, and the Yeas and Nays being demanded, it was decided in the affirmative—Yeas 59, Nays 18.

Those who voted in the affirmative are.

Messrs. Mason, Hunter, Butler, *Berrien*, Turner, *Johnson* of La. Downs, Davis, Foote, King, Fitzpatrick, Borland, Sebastian, Westcott, Yulee, S. Houston, Atkinson, Bayly, Bedinger, Bocock, W. G. Brown, Meade, McDowell, *Pendleton*, R. A. Thomson, Daniel, McKay, Venable, Burt, Rhett, Simpson, Wallace, Woodward Holmes, H. Cobb, Haralson, Iverson, Lumpkin, Bowdon, W. R. W. Cobb, *Gayle*, Harrison, Inge, Featherston. Jacob Thompson, La Sere, Morse, Hill. R. W. Johnson, *Cabell*, Kaufman, Clarke, Pillsbury, Phelps, Peyton, McDowell and Ligon—59.

Those who voted in the negative are:

Messrs. *Metcalf, Underwood*, Rusk, *Flournoy, Goggin, Preston, Clingman, J. W. Jones, T. B. King, Stephens, Toombs, Hilliard, Morehead, Cocke, Crozier*, McLane, *Roman* and *Chapman*—18.

Mr. HILLIARD submitted the following resolution:

Resolved, That when this meeting adjourn, it shall adjourn to meet on the 23d of February next.

The Yeas and Nays were demanded, and it was decided in the negative—Yeas 22, Nays 51.

Those who voted in the affirmative are:

Messrs. Metcalf, Underwood, S. Houston, Flournoy, Goggin, Preston, Clingman, J. W. Jones, T. B. King, Stephens, Toombs, Hilliard, Morehead, Cocke, Crozier, McLane, Chapman, Roman, Cobb, Hyralson, Lumpkin and McDowell—22.

Those who voted in the negative are:

Messrs. Mason, Hunter, Butler, Berrien, Turney, Johnson of La. Downs, Davis, Foote, King, Fitzpatrick, Westcott, Yulee, Borland, Sebastian, Rusk, Atkinson, Bayly, Beale, Bedinger, Bocock, W. G. Brown, Fulton, R. A. Thomson. Daniel, McKay, Venable, Burt, Rhett, Holmes, Woodward, Wallace, Simpson, Iverson, Lumpkin, Bowdon, W. R. W. Cobb, Gayle, Harris, Inge, Featherston, J. Thompson, La Sere, Morse, Hill, R. W. Johnson, Cabell, Clark, Kaufman, Peyton, Pillsbury—51.

Mr. BAYLY then moved that the Address reported to a former meeting, on the 15th of January, be adopted; which motion prevailed; and the Yeas and Nays being demanded, were as follows:

Those who voted in the affirmative are:

Messrs. Mason, Hunter, Butler, Calhoun, Davis, Fitzpatrick, Westcott, Yulee, Atkinson, Bayly, Bocock, Bedinger, Beale, W. G. Brown, Meade, R. A. Thompson, Venable, Burt, Holmes, Simpson, Wallace, Rheti, Woodward, Bowdon, *Gayle*, Harris, Inge, Featherston, Jacob Thompson, La Sere, Morse, R. W. Johnson, Pillsbury, and Stanton—34—Whigs in *Italics*.

Mr. BAYLY then moved that the Address reported to a former meeting, on the 15th of January, be adopted; which motion prevailed; and the Yeas and Nays being demanded, were as follows:

Those who voted in the affirmative are:

Messrs. Mason, Hunter, Butler, Calhoun, Turney, Downs, Davis, Foote, Fitzpatrick, Borland, Sebastian, Westcott, Yulee, Atkinson, Bayly, Bedinger, Bocock, Beale, W. G. Brown, Meade, R. A. Thompson, Daniel, Venable, Burt, Holmes, Rhett, Simpson, Woodward, Wallace, Iverson, Lumpkin, Bowdon, Gayle, Harris, Inge, Featherston, Jacob Thompson, La Sere, Morse, R. W Johnson. Pillsbury and Stanton—42.

Those who voted in the negative are:

Messrs. *Berrien, Metcalf, Underwood, Johnson* of La. Rusk, S. Houston, *Pendleton, Preston, Clingman, Toombs, Stephens, Hilliard, Morehead, Cocke, Cabell, Roman, and Chapman*—17—Whigs in *Italics*.

On motion, it was

Resolved, That the journals of this meeting and the Committee be signed by the Secretary, and published in the papers of this District.

On motion of Mr. IVERSON, it was

Resolved farther, That the Address adopted by this meeting be left with the Secretary for such members as approve of the same to sign it: and that the publication thereof, when signed, shall be suspended until the same be ordered by a subsequent meeting of those who may sign it.

The meeting then adjourned *sine die*.

SPEECH OF JOHN A. DIX

IN THE UNITED STATES SENATE,

On printing the Resolutions of the Legislature of the State of New York.

Mr. President:—When I presented these resolutions, I certainly had not the least expectation that I should be called on to say anything in their defence. I have been four years a member of this body, and never since I have had a seat here have I known an objection raised, on a motion to print resolutions passed by one of the sovereign States of this Union.

I do not know that I should have noticed this opposition, extraordinary as it appears, but for the remarks with which it has been accompanied, and especially those made by the Senator from Florida, (Mr. Yulee) in relation to the character of the resolutions. He pronounces them insulting to the other States. Sir, there is nothing in them to justify such an imputation. I shall endeavour to make it appear so; and for this purpose I shall take them up, seriatim, for the purpose of showing what they are; and I begin with the preamble.

"STATE OF NEW YORK—*Concurrent Resolutions.*—Whereas the people of the State of New Mexico have petitioned Congress for the establishment of a territorial government, which shall protect them against the institution of domestic Slavery while they remain a territory of the United States, and have also petitioned Congress for protection against the unfounded claims of the State of Texas to a large portion of their territory lying east of the Rio Grande; and whereas it would be unjust to the people of New Mexico and California, *and revolting to the spirit of the age, to permit domestic Slavery—an institution from which they are now free*—to be introduced among them; and whereas the acquisition of New Mexico by the United States, the people thereof have a right to expect the protection of the general Government, and should be secured in the full possession and enjoyment of their territory; therefore."

There is no original matter in this preamble, except the sentiment that it would be "revolting to the spirit of the age" to permit domestic Slavery to be introduced among those who are now free from it. All the rest is but a recital of what the people of New Mexico have expressed in their petition, which was presented to the Senate by the honourable Senator from Missouri, on my left, (Colonel Benton.) I do not intend to inquire how far that petition may be said to express the sentiments of the people of that territory. When that question fairly comes before us, I have no doubt the Senator who has the petition in charge will be able to show that it is a true index to the prevailing opinions and wishes of the New Mexicans. But this is a matter with which the legislature of New York had nothing to do. They took the proceedings of Congress as they found them, this petition constituting a part, and they have recited it as one of the moving causes of the declarations of opinion they have made.

I have said that there is no original matter in this preamble excepting the sentiment that it would be "revolting to the spirit of the age" to introduce Slavery where it does not exist. I might be justified in asserting that this expression is but a repetition of what has been said, again and again, in legislative resolutions, and speeches here and elsewhere, since this question of carrying Slavery into territory where it is prohibited by the fundamental law has been agitated. It is a sentiment to which nearly the whole people of the non-slaveholding States have responded, and no responsibility for it can be cast upon New York, which does not belong equally to them.

But, sir, let us leave the preamble and proceed to the resolutions. The first is in these words:

"Resolved, (if the Assembly concur.) That our Senators in Congress be instructed, and our Representatives in Congress be requested, to use their best efforts to procure the passage of laws for the establishment of governments for the territory acquired by the late treaty of peace with Mexico; and that by such laws involuntary servitude, except for crime, be excluded from such territories."

This resolution is in sentiments, if not in words, identical with those which have been passed by fifteen of the thirty States of the Union. With a single exception all the non-slaveholding, and one of the slave-holding States have declared themselves opposed to the extension of Slavery to territory now free. Sir, I fully concur in the propriety of this declaration. I believe that Congress possesses the power to prohibit Slavery in California and New Mexico, that it is our duty to exercise the power, and that it should be exercised now. I am always for acting when the proper time for action has come. I am utterly opposed to any course which shall cast upon others the responsibility which belongs to ourselves. The resolution looks to the exclusion of Slavery from New Mexico and California during their territorial condition only. It does not look beyond that condition with a view to control the people when they shall come into the Union. It contemplates no invasion of State sovereignty. In this view of the subject, one of the New York presses, which has resisted all interference with Slavery even in the territories, pronounced these resolutions conciliatory in their character. I do not know that I should call them either conciliatory or the reverse.—They take firmly the ground New York has always taken, that Slavery shall by no act of hers be further extended. She believes it to be the ground of principle, of justice and of right, and I do not hesitate to say she will never abandon it—never, never.

I will now read the second resolution.

"Resolved, (if the Assembly concur.) That the territory lying between the Nueces and Rio Grande, and that portion of New Mexico lying east of the Rio Grande, are the common property of the United States; and that our Senators in Congress be instructed, and our Representatives in Congress be requested, to use their best efforts to preserve the same as such common property, and protect it from the unfounded claims of the State of Texas, and prohibit the extension over it of the laws of Texas or the institution of domestic Slavery."

In respect to this resolution I have nothing to say, excepting this—that it expresses the opinions of a large majority of the members of both branches of the legislature, and as such, it will receive my respectful consideration. I understand that the democratic members for the most part voted against it. When this question comes before us in a practical shape, I shall listen with attention to all the Senator from Texas (Mr. Rusk) has to say in defence of the Texas boundary claims.

The last resolution with the exception of the resolution of instruction, intended to carry it out, is in these words:

"Resolved, (if the Assembly concur,) That the existence of prisons for the confinement, and marts for the sale of slaves, at the seat of the National Government, is viewed by this legislature with deep regret and mortification; and that such prisons and marts ought forthwith to be abolished."

This resolution embodies the opinions of the members of the Legislature in relation to the traffic in slaves in this district—a subject which has extensively engaged the attention of the people of the Union, and, in former times, of the inhabitants of the district also. There is nothing in the resolution which contemplates any interference with rights of property here. It has no purpose of abolition. But it condemns a traffic, which is entirely independent of the tenure of slaves by the inhabitants, and which would, as I understand, have been suppressed long ago, if this district had remained a part of the State of Maryland, by which it was ceded to the United States. This is a matter which concerns the people of the whole Union. As the seat of the Federal Government we all have an interest in this city. Nothing which affects its honour or its prosperity is alien to ours. The people of Maine have the same interest here as the people of Louisiana, and are as fully authorized to express their opinions on any matter of local concern which belongs to the district. It is under this view of the subject that the Legislature of New York has passed the resolution I have just read. They believe the traffic in slaves here, under the shadow of this capitol, to be wrong; they believe that it should be discontinued, and they have said

In expressing this opinion, they have spoken in language to which no exception can fairly be taken. They have not used terms half so significant as those which have been used by the inhabitants of the district themselves. In 1802, (46 years ago,) as I understand, the traffic in slaves was presented by the Grand Jury of Alexandria as a public nuisance. In 1816, John Randolph, of Roanoke, introduced a resolution in the House of Representatives to inquire if the inhuman and illegal traffic in slaves was carried on in this district, and if so, what measures were necessary to put a stop to it. I understand the traffic has been presented by the Grand Jury of this city, and that the court decided that there was no authority to suppress it without an act of Congress. But this is not all. I hold in my hand a petition presented to Congress in 1828 by the inhabitants of this district; and I will read it for the purpose of showing that the New York resolutions fall far short of what they have said and done.

To the Honourable the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

We, the undersigned, citizens of the counties of Washington and Alexandria, in the District of Columbia, beg leave to call the attention of your honourable body to an evil of serious magnitude, which greatly impairs the prosperity and happiness of this District, and casts the reproach of inconsistency upon the free institutions established among us.

While the laws of the United States denounce the foreign Slave Trade as piracy, and punish with death those who are found engaged in its perpetration, there exists in this District, the seat of the National Government, a domestic Slave Trade, scarcely less disgraceful in its character, and even more demoralizing in its influence. For this is not, like the former, carried on against a barbarous nation; its victims are reared up among the people of this country, educated in the precepts of the same religion, and imbued with similar domestic attachments.

These people are, without their consent, torn from their homes; husband and wife are frequently separated, and sold into distant parts; children are taken from their parents without regard to the ties of nature, and the most endearing bonds of affection are broken forever.

Nor is this traffic confined to those who are legally slaves for life. Some who are entitled to Freedom, and many who have a limited time to serve, are sold into unconditional Slavery, and, owing to the defectiveness of our laws, they are generally carried out of the District before the necessary steps can be taken for their release.

We behold these scenes continually taking place among us, and lament our inability to prevent them. The people of this District have, within themselves, no means of legislative redress; and we, therefore, appeal to your honourable body as the only one invested by the American Constitution with the power to relieve us.

Nor is it only from the rapacity of slave traders that the coloured race in this District are doomed to suffer.—Even the laws which govern us sanction and direct, in certain cases, a procedure that we believe is unparalleled in glaring injustice by anything at present known among the Governments of Christendom. An instance of the operation of these laws, which occurred during the last Summer, we will briefly relate.

A coloured man, who stated that he was entitled to Freedom, was taken up as a runaway slave, and lodged in the jail of Washington city. He was advertised, but no one appearing to claim him, he was according to law, put up at public auction, for the payment of his jail fees, and sold as a slave for life! He was purchased by a slave-trader, who was not required to give security for his remaining in the District, and he was soon after shipped at Alexandria for one of the Southern States. An attempt was made by some benevolent individuals to have the sale postponed until his claim to Freedom could be investigated, but their efforts were unavailing; and thus was a human being sold into perpetual bondage, at the capital of the freest Government on earth, without even a pretence of trial, or an allegation of crime.

We blush for our country while we relate this disgraceful transaction, and we would fain conceal it from the world, did not its very enormity inspire us with the hope that it will rouse the philanthropist and the patriot to exertion. We have no hesitation in believing your honourable body never intended that this odious law should be enforced; it was adopted with the old code of Maryland, from which we believe it has been expunged, since this district was ceded to the General Government.

The fact of its having been so recently executed, shows the necessity of this subject being investigated by a power which we confidently hope will be ready to correct it.

We are aware of the difficulties that would attend any attempt to relieve us from these grievances by a *sudden* emancipation of the slaves in this District, and we would, therefore, be far from recommending so rash a measure. But the course pursued by many of the States of this confederacy, that have happily succeeded in relieving themselves from a similar burden, together with the bright example which has been set us by the South American Republics, proves, most conclusively, that a course of gradual emancipation, to commence at some fixed period, and to take effect only upon those who may thereafter be born or removed into the District, might be pursued without detriment to the present proprietors, and would greatly redound to the prosperity and honour of our country.

The existence among us of a distinct class of people, who, by their condition as slaves, are deprived of almost every incentive to virtue and industry, and shut out from many of the sources of light and knowledge, has an evident tendency to corrupt the morals of the people, and to damp the spirit of enterprise, by accustoming the rising generation to look with contempt upon honest labour, and to depend for support too much upon the labour of others. It prevents a useful and industrious class of people from settling among us, by rendering the means of subsistence more precarious to the labouring class of whites.

It diminishes the resources of the community, by throwing the earnings of the poor into the coffers of the rich; thus rendering the former dependent, servile, and improvident, while the latter are tempted to become, in the same proportion, luxurious, and prodigal.

That these disastrous results flow from the existence of Slavery among us is sufficiently conspicuous, when we contrast the languishing condition of this district and the surrounding country with the prosperity of those parts of the Union which are less favoured in point of climate and location, but blessed with a free and industrious population.

We would, therefore, respectfully pray that these grievances may claim the attention of your honourable body, and that a law of Congress may be enacted, declaring that all children of slaves born in the District of Columbia after the 4th day of July, 1828, shall be free at the age of twenty-five years; and that those laws which authorise the selling of supposed runaways for their prison fees or maintenance may be repealed.

And, also, that laws may be enacted to prevent slaves from being removed into this District, or brought in for sale, hire, or transportation; without, however, preventing members of Congress, resident strangers, or travellers, from bringing and taking away with them their domestic servants.

This petition is signed by one thousand and sixty names. I have counted them, and I believe correctly. Among them are those of many of the most respectable inhabitants—one, which I take to be that of Judge Cranch, then and now at the head of the judiciary of the district; General John P. Vanness, the largest property holder, and others equally respectable and well known. This petition goes much farther than the New York resolutions. It prays for the abolition of Slavery, as well as the traffic in slaves. It uses much stronger language. It pronounces the Slave Trade in this district "disgraceful in its character," and "demoralizing in its influence."—The people of this district have done all in their power to rid themselves of what they consider an evil, affecting their prosperity and their good name. They have exonerated themselves from responsibility on account of this traffic. The responsibility is thrown upon Congress; and New York, as one of the sovereign States of this Union, has attempted, in respectful language, and in terms far less significant than those employed by the inhabitants of the district, to exonerate herself from it.—She is, in fact, acting in accordance with their prayer to Congress; and if in the judgement of any Senator she merits reproach for her interposition, he cannot fail to see that the inhabitants of the district have incurred a much larger share, by asking for the abolition of Slavery, and by denouncing the traffic in slaves in far less measured terms than herself.

I regret, Mr. President, that I should have been called on to enter into this discussion; but, as all know, it was forced upon me. I came here from a sick room, almost from a sick bed, never in my life feeling less able or disposed to engage in a contention of any sort. But I will not sit here in silence, if I have strength to stand up, and listen to attacks upon the legislature of the State I have in part the honour to represent here—attacks which I conceive to be wholly uncalled for and unwarranted by the resolutions on which they are founded.

The Anti-Slavery Standard.

Without Concealment---Without Compromise.

NEW-YORK, THURSDAY FEBRUARY, 8, 1849.

The Parting of the Ways.

Who hath not been a poet? who hath not,
With Life's new quiver full of winged years,
Shot at a venture, and then following on,
Stood doubtful at the Parting of the Ways?

There once I stood in dream, and, as I paused,
Looking this way and that, came forth to me
The figure of a Woman veiled, that said
"My name is Duty: turn and follow me!"
Something there was that chilled me in her voice;
I felt Youth's hand grow slack and cold in mine,
As if to be withdrawn, and I replied:
"O, leave the hot, wild heart within my breast!
Duty comes soon enough, too soon comes Death;
This slippery globe of life whirls of itself,
Hasting our youth away into the dark;
These senses, quivering with electric heats,
Too soon will show like nests on wintry boughs,
Obtrusive emptiness, too palpable wreck,
Which whistling northwinds line with downy snow
Sometimes, or fringe with foliaged rime, in vain,
Thither the singing birds no more return."

Then glowed to me a Maiden from the left,
With bosom half disclosed, and naked arms
More white and undulant than necks of swans;
And all before her steps an influence ran
Warm as the whispering South that opens buds
And swells the laggard sails of Northern May.
"I am called, Pleasure, come with me!" she said,
Then laughed and shook out sunshine from her hair,
Nor only that, but, so it seemed, shook out
All memory, too, and all the moonlit past,
Old loves, old aspirations, and old dreams,
More beautiful for being old and gone.

So we two went together, downward sloped
The path through yellow meads, or so I dreamed,
Yellow with sunshine and young green, but I
Saw naught nor heard, shut up in one close joy;
I only felt the hand within my own,
Transmuting all my blood to golden fire,
Dissolving all my brain in throbbing mist.

Suddenly shrank the hand; suddenly burst
A cry that split the torpor of my brain,
And, as the first sharp thrust of lightning loosens
From the heaped cloud its rain, loosened my sense:
"Save me!" it thrilled, "O, hide me, there is Death!
Death the divider, the unmerciful,
That Digs his pitfalls under love and youth,
And covers beauty up in the cold ground,
Horrible Death, bringer of endless dark;
Let him not see me, hide me in thy breast!"
Thereat I strove to clasp her, but my arms
Met only what slipped crumbling down and fell
A handful of gray ashes at my feet.

I would have fled, I would have followed back
That pleasant path we came, but all was changed;
Rocky the way, abrupt, and hard to find.
Yet I toiled on, and, toiling on, I thought,
"That way lies Youth and Wisdom and all Good;
For only by unlearning Wisdom comes,
And climbing backward to diviner Youth;
What the world teaches, profits to the world;
What the soul teaches, profits to the soul,
Which then first stands erect with Godward face,
When she lets fall her pack of withered facts,
The gleanings of the outward eye and ear,
And looks and listens with her finer sense:
Nor Truth, nor Knowledge cometh from without."

After long weary days, I stood again
And waited at the Parting of the Ways;
Again the figure of a Woman veiled
Stood forth and beckoned, and I followed now:
Down to no bower of roses led the path,
But through the streets of towns where chattering Cold
Hewed wood for fires whose glow was owned and fenced,
Where Nakedness wove garments of warm wool
Not for itself;—or through the fields it led,
Where Hunger reaped the unattainable grain,
Where Idleness enforced saw idle lands,
Leagues of unpeopled soil, the common Earth,
Walled round with paper against God and Man.

"I cannot look," I groaned, "at only these;
The heart grows hardened with perpetual wont,
And palters with a feigned necessity,
Bargaining with itself to be content;
Let me behold thy face."

The Form replied

"Men follow Duty, never overtake;
Duty nor lifts her veil, nor looks behind."
But, as she spake, a loosened lock of hair
Slipped from beneath her hood, and I, who looked
To see it gray and thin, saw amplest gold,
Not that dull metal dug from sordid earth,
But such as the retiring sunset-flood
Leaves heaped on bays and capes of island cloud.
"O, Guide divine," I prayed, "although not yet
I may repair the virtue, which I feel
Gone out at touch of untuned things and foul,
With draughts of Beauty, yet declare how soon!"

"Faithless and faint of heart," the Voice returned,
"Thou seest no beauty save thou make it first;
Man, Woman, Nature, each is but a glass
Where the soul sees the image of herself,
Visible echoes, offspring of herself.
But, since thou need'st assurance of how soon,
Wait till that Angel comes who opens all,
The reconciler, he who lifts the veil,
The reuniter, the restbringer, Death."

I waited, and methought he came, but how,
Or in what shape, I doubted, for no sign
By touch or mark, he gave me as he passed;
Only I know a lily that I held
Snapt short below the head and shrivelled up;
Then turned my Guide and looked at me unveiled,
And I beheld no face of matron stern,
But that Enchantment I had followed erst,
Only more fair, more clear to eye and brain,
Heightened and chastened by a household charm;
She smiled and, "which is fairest," said her eyes,
"The witch's snowy Florimel or mine?"

J. R. L.

William and Ellen Craft.

The singular and romantic story of the escape of these two persons from Slavery was told at the Annual Meeting of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society at Boston, week before last, by Wm. W. Brown, and the Crafts themselves appeared before the audience, exciting of course, a most lively interest by their appearance.—The facts of their escape were stated by Mr. Brown in a letter to the *Liberator* a few weeks since, and are briefly as follows:

William and Ellen Craft, man and wife, lived with different masters in the State of Georgia. Ellen is so near white, that she can pass without suspicion for a white woman. Her husband is much darker. He is a mechanic, and by working nights and Sundays, he laid up money enough to bring himself and his wife out of Slavery. Their plan was without precedent; and though novel, was the means of getting them their freedom.—Ellen dressed in man's clothing, and passed as the *master*, while her husband passed as the *servant*. In this way they travelled from Georgia to Philadelphia. They are now out of the reach of the blood-hounds of the South. On their journey, they put up at the best hotels where they stopped. Neither of them can read or write. And Ellen, knowing that she would be called upon to write her name at the hotels, &c. tied her right hand up as though it was lame, which proved of some service to her, as she was called upon several times at hotels to "register" her name. In Charleston, S. C. they put up at the hotel which Governor M'Duffie and John C. Calhoun generally make their home, yet these distinguished advocates of the "peculiar institution" say that the slaves cannot take care of themselves. They arrived in Philadelphia, in four days from the time they started. Their history, especially that of their escape, is replete with interest. They will be at the meeting of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society, in Boston, in the latter part of this month, where I know the history of their escape will be listened to with great interest. They are very intelligent. They are young, Ellen 22, and Wm. 24 years of age. Ellen is truly a heroine.

At the meeting in Boston Mr. Brown read an article from a Newark paper, (*the Daily Mercury*) which we copy as a most interesting part of the story. It is as follows:

AN INCIDENT AT THE SOUTH.

One bright starlight night, in the month of December last, I found myself in the cabin of the steamer General Clinch, then lying in the port of Savannah, and bound for Charleston. I had gone early on board, in order to select a good berth, and having got tired of reading the papers, amused myself with watching the appearance of the passengers as they dropped in one after another, and I being a believer in physiognomy, forming my own opinion of their characters.

The second bell rang, and as I yawningly returned my watch to my pocket, my attention was attracted by the appearance of a young man who entered the cabin, supported by his servant, a strapping negro.

The man was bundled up in a capacious overcoat; his face was bandaged with a white handkerchief, and its expression entirely hid by a pair of enormous green spectacles.

There was something so mysterious and unusual, about the young man, as he sat restlessly in the corner, that curiosity led me to observe him more closely.

He appeared anxious to avoid notice, and before the steamer had fairly left the wharf, requested in a low womanly voice to be shown to his berth, as he was an invalid and must retire early—his name he gave as Mr. Johnson. His servant was called and he was put quietly to bed. I paced the deck until Tybee light grew dim in the distance and then went to my berth.

I awoke in the morning with the sun shining in my face—we were then just passing St. Helena, and soon after were out at sea. It was a mild, beautiful morning and most of the passengers were on deck enjoying the freshness of the air and stimulating their appetites for breakfast. Mr. Johnson soon made his appearance, arrayed the same as on the night before, and took his seat quietly on the guard of the boat.

From the better opportunity afforded by day light, I found that he was a slight built, apparently handsome young man, with black hair and eyes, and of a darkness of complexion that betokened Spanish extraction. Any notice from others seemed painful to him, so to satisfy my curiosity I questioned his servant who was standing near, and gained the following information.

His master was an invalid—he had suffered a long time with a complication of diseases that had baffled the skill of the best physicians in Georgia—he was now suffering principally with the "rheumatism," and was scarcely able to walk or help himself in any way. He came from Atlanta, Georgia, and was now on his way to Philadelphia, at which place resided his uncle a celebrated physician, through whose means he hoped to be restored to perfect health.

This information, communicated in a bold off hand manner, enlisted my sympathies for the sufferer, although it occurred to me that he walked rather too gingerly for a person inflicted with so many ailments.

We arrived at Charleston, and I there lost sight of Mr. Johnson, an acquaintance at my elbow remarking that he was either a "*woman* or a *genius*."

This morning I cut from the New-York *Herald* the accompanying extract, and there is no doubt in my mind but that William and Ellen Craft are no other than my travelling companions, Mr. Johnson and servant. A.

Here follows Brown's letter just published in the *Liberator*. The Crafts are still in Massachusetts and have appeared in several places, at public meetings. Their notoriety perhaps will be their best safeguard, as it would be difficult to carry off persons so well known by stealth, and quite impossible to get them out of Eastern Massachusetts openly; nevertheless a careful watch may save trouble.

CASE OF THE ALLEGED SLAVER.—The *Tribune* gives the following report of the final examination of Capt. Stor

☞ Mr. Edwin Chapman of Ashley Hall, Bristol, England, says, in a private letter to a friend in this country:

"Permit me one word with regard to foreign and domestic evils. I do not shut my eyes while feeling sorrowful and indignant at American Slavery, to the condition of vast masses in my native country. It is with me a mournful and a fearful subject. My hope and consolation is that all classes are waking up to a perception of the evil, that education, in the comprehensive sense of the word, is enlightening the millions, and that time only is required to enable them to work out their own redemption from bondage to ignorance, poverty and vice, there being not any "peculiar institution" demanding their everlasting degradation."

We have never known a British Abolitionist of any worth who held any other sentiment than one of entire sympathy with the masses of Great Britain, the continued assertion of the Pro-Slavery press of this country to the contrary notwithstanding. Indeed, the great mass of the Anti-Slavery people of Great Britain, those who fought the battle of Emancipation with the Government and the West India interest, were themselves of the working class; and those of them who were of the nobility and gentry, were known then, or are known now, as the leaders in every movement for the good of man. Mr. Chapman truly represents his Anti-Slavery fellow countrymen as a class.

The Prayers of the American Republic.—In the proclamation for a day of public thanksgiving and praise, just issued by the Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, to the people of the State, they are among other things advised to pray that God, "will vouchsafe His aid to our fellowmen in the Old World, who are struggling to throw off the oppression of ages, and to regain their long-lost rights."

"That He will in our own country arrest the further extension of Slavery, and open the way in His wise providence for the extinction of an institution, alike repugnant to the rights of humanity, and to that just rule of conduct laid down by the Son of God, binding upon all men, everywhere, of 'doing unto others, as we would that others should do unto us.'"

The proclamation is counter-signed by the Slaveholder, W. B. Calhoun.

"There is something ludicrous," says the (Boston) *Christian Register*, in quoting the above brief article from the *London Inquirer*, "in the confounding of Mr. W. B. Calhoun, Secretary of State of Mass. with Mr. J. C. Calhoun, United States Senator for South Carolina." The London editor certainly ought to be ashamed of himself for not knowing the geographical difference between Massachusetts and South Carolina, but he was not so far wrong as to the moral similitude between their statesmen. If the thanksgiving proclamation of Massachusetts was not countersigned by a Slaveholder, it was *signed* by a Governor who beat up for recruits for the Slaveholders' war.

☞ The petition which the Mayor and Council of the city of Washington offered, or rather signed,—for whether it has ever been offered or not to Congress seems a question—asking for the abolition of the Slave Trade in the District of Columbia is as follows:

To the Honourable, the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:

The undersigned, Members of the Board of Aldermen and Common Council of the city of Washington, having in common with their fellow-citizens long regarded with disapprobation the importation of slaves into the District of Columbia for purposes of sale or traffic elsewhere, deeming it alike prejudicial to the interest of our city and offensive to public sentiment, request your honourable body to restrain such traffic by the enactment of some law similar in its provisions to that embraced in the code of Laws for the District of Columbia, reported to the House of Representatives in the year 1832, by Mr. Wilde of Georgia, and to the Senate by Mr. Chambers of Maryland; the enactments in the adjoining States of Maryland or Virginia on this subject; or grant to the respective corporate authorities of Washington and Georgetown such powers as will enable them to remedy this evil.

The Fugitive Slave Law.—The bill for the farther protection of personal liberty, is still before the Legislature of this State. The latest action upon it was upon the 1st. instant, in the Senate, when

Mr. Treadwell called for the consideration of the report of the committee of the whole on the bill for the further protection of personal liberty.

Mr. Tamblin moved to lay it on the table. Lost; ayes 5, nays 13.

After a long debate the report was agreed to, and the bill ordered to a 3d reading; ayes 17, nays 5, as follows:—

Ayes—Messrs. Betts, Bokee, Brownson, Burch, Coffin, Bole, Colt, Cook, Cornwell, Fine, Fox, Fuller, Geddes, S. H. P. Hall, Hawley, Little, Treadwell—17.

Nays—Messrs. Bush, Clark, Lawrence, Tamblin, Williams—5.

Ten of the Senators it seems were absent from their seats, or did not vote.

☞ The Pennsylvania Freeman says that a society has recently been formed in Philadelphia, under the name of the Philadelphia Anti-Slavery Society, auxiliary to the American Anti-Slavery Society. This movement is among the coloured people, and may be considerded as a sort of reaction to the attempts which have recently been made in Philadelphia, we are sorry to hear, by Mr. C. L. Remond to alienate the coloured people from the Abolitionists. Precisely what are the grievances complained of by Mr. Remond we have not learned, and are at a loss to guess.

☞ Hon. S. Lauren will accept our thanks for a copy of a Congressional map of the Battles of Mexico, with the lines of the marches and encampments of the American freebooters, very appropriately printed in *red*.

The Steamer United States, about which some anxiety was felt, arrived at this port on Monday afternoon, after a passage of 27 days from Cowes. She brings no later news than that received by the *Canada*.

To Correspondents.

J. R. L. "Flaccid, that will not fling against the wind!" He shall hear from us speedily nevertheless.

S. A. R. Such communications are rejected, not because the subject is not an important one, nor because our belief is not entirely orthodox with regard to it, nor because the communications may not possess great merit; but simply because the *Standard* is devoted to the Anti-Slavery cause, and cannot run the risk, even could it do so in good faith with its readers, of a lengthened controversy on other subjects.

Notes on New Books.

Our Cousins in Ohio. By Mary Howitt. From the Diary of an American Mother. *New York, Collins & Brothers, 254 Pearl st.*

Mrs. Howitt had, as many of her friends and admirers know, a sister in Ohio, who died, we believe, within a year. This little book, it would seem, is from her Diary, and Mrs. Howitt's share in it is merely that of editor. So we conclude from the announcement in the Preface that it is "entirely true," which leaves no room for the supposition that it is in any degree fictitious.

To write good—we do not use the word in a limited sense—books for children is a rare talent, and Mrs. Howitt's sister seems to have possessed it in an eminent degree. There are no very wonderful incidents in this book, and nothing in the circumstances of the parties concerned to create them. The home of the author is on the banks of the Ohio, a short distance back from the river, embellished with taste, and comfortable with all the appliances which competence produces, but in these respects would not probably be distinguished from thousands of other homes, equally beautiful and with no greater comforts. But its charm is in the life of the family who dwell there, whose daily acts of business and of pleasure are recorded with a simplicity and truthfulness which reveals a beautiful picture of a harmonious and happy domestic circle, bound together by mutual love, working together in the round of daily duties, and aiding and encouraging each other in all pursuits and studies, tending to cultivate the mind, and enlarge the heart. All the facts here told of a year's life might happen to any family in a pleasant neighbourhood, and blessed with so much of this world's goods as to be not without all necessary comforts and many luxuries, and yet not removed from the necessity of labour, but the inner life of these people shines through these outward facts, and makes a history, which, we remember enough of our childhood's feelings to be sure, must delight and amuse all young persons. The Story, if a diary of actual occurrences may be called so, is full of country pleasures, crowded with rural sights and sounds, and will give a thousand hints to children of pleasant and useful occupations, even if, as poor denizens of cities, they have only a yard, with a bit of grass of the size of a table-cloth, to play in. The book is intended specially for children, but grown people need not be ashamed to be seen reading it. It is a most delightful one for the young, or the old who remember that they have been young.

Blackwood's Magazine. *L. Scott & Co.'s republication.* The number for January was issued ten days ago, and excites something more than the ordinary interest from the announcement, which is confidently made in various quarters, that "The Caxtons," continued in this number, is by Bulwer. With something of an apparent imitation of Southey's "Doctor," and something more of "Tristram Shandy," as we have observed in some former notice, the "Caxtons" is nevertheless an admirable and most original work, and in altogether a new vein for its author. But without the chapters of this popular novel, the present number of Blackwood is unusually interesting. The leading paper, on the year of Revolutions, we have no doubt is well written, and high Toryish, though we have not read it; but the several reviews of a late and very valuable work on the Artists of Spain, by W. Sterling; of the Memoirs of Kirkaldy of Grange, of the one stalwart knights of the most eventful periods of Scottish history, and whose life was a romance; of the Dodo and its Kindred, an article of special interest to naturalists; and of a german book of travels up the White Nile, are all of them excellent in their way, and give the reader a good insight into the subject of the book reviewed.

The present number of Blackwood, we observe, is the first of a new volume, the best time of course to commence a subscription.

Memoirs of Sir Thomas Fowell Buxton, Baronet.—With Selections from his Correspondence, Edited by his son, Charles Buxton, Esq. *Henry Longstreth, Market street, Philadelphia.* Contrary to our expectations this book has found a publisher in this country, and the fact deserves to be marked as one of the "signs of the times." Sir Thomas Fowell Buxton's fame rests, as those of our readers who have taken the trouble to follow us in a review of the events of his life, know, upon years of devoted and self-sacrificing devotion to the cause of West India Emancipation.—Such a character is not one to command the admiration of our pro-slavery countrymen, and as Anti-Slavery literature has hitherto been *tabooed* by American publishers, such a republication as this, out of the ranks of Abolitionists proper, marks an era in the history of book-making in this country. Mr. Longstreth, we trust may find it a successful experiment.

We need not say that we regard this biography a most valuable addition to the literature of Anti-Slavery, as we have given good evidence of the estimation in which we hold it, in the liberal extracts we have made from its pages. Mr. Buxton, the son, who modestly styles himself the editor of the work, and would convey, by his title-page, the impression that he only arranged and published his father's correspondence, rather than that he was the writer of a biography, has fulfilled the first duty, so far as it was necessary, with admirable good taste and judgment; and his task as a writer of his father's life, which was much the most difficult, he has performed so faithfully as to make the volume in fact an original work, and at the same time, with such impartiality and ability as to render it one of great value and interest. As a history of the Anti-Slavery movement in Great Britain it is as yet unequalled, and from the circumstances of the case can hardly be surpassed till a more general history of British Emancipation shall cover the whole ground, and include the biographies of various persons.

Mr. Longstreth's publication is well printed in clear type, on good paper, and makes a handsome volume. It includes a portrait of Sir Thomas Fowell Buxton, which is a remarkably correct copy of that contained in the English edition, though the engraving is one of these poor mezzotints for which Philadelphia is, or ought to be, both famous and infamous.

As the publisher, we believe, will have, in a great measure, to rely upon Abolitionists for a remuneration for his enterprise in giving this work to American readers, we again express the hope that he may not be disappointed, and that the experiment may prove that the reading Anti-Slavery world—which is not a small one—is willing to pay for that of the want of which they have, in past time, with so much reason complained. There is a fund of valuable and interesting Anti-Slavery reading, literally sealed books to American readers, because no American publisher ventures to risk a republication of English works of this character in this country.

General Intelligence.

Congressional.

We copy from the *Herald* the following report of a debate on Slavery in the House on the 30th ulto.

The House then resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on the State of the Union, (Mr. J. R. Ingersoll in the chair,) and proceeded to the consideration of the bill making appropriations for the support of the Navy for the year ending June 30, 1850.

Mr. C. Brown, of Pennsylvania, said that, for the last twenty years, he had opposed the agitation of the question of Slavery. He had heretofore been content to give a vote merely, and would not now address the Committee, were it not for the remarkable speech of the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. Thompson) which struck him and the House with surprise. The gentleman had been inconsistent in his course on this subject, (which Mr. Brown proceeded to show.) Mr. Brown referred to a paragraph in the speech of Mr. Thompson, to the effect: "While our constituents are calm at home, praying for the peace and prosperity of the country, there are persons in this hall disturbing the tranquility of the Union. But, thank God, there was a time coming, when a spirit of conservatism would arise from the Federal Executive, which would pour oil upon the troubled waters when neither Whigs nor Democrats would especially be consulted, but the welfare of the country." No doubt the gentleman honestly expressed his sentiments; but a change had come over the spirit of his dream. Mr. Brown attributed Mr. Thompson's feelings to the influence of the man of the South (General Taylor) and the future prospects of the Whig party. If conservatism—that which will allay angry excitement and preserve the Union—be the result of General Taylor's election, then he would regret that he had opposed him in the last campaign. He congratulated the country on the bright prospects which are now before us. Mr. Brown condemned the movements of the agitators. Among other things, he said that, the other day, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Giddings,) offered a resolution, to allow the blacks of the District to vote on the subject of abolition here. The proposition received seventy-seven votes. Among them were members from Connecticut, the people of which State, not long ago, by a vote of three to one, refused to pass a law giving to blacks the right of suffrage. Illinois has voted that no negro shall come and live there; and yet members from that State voted in this House to make negroes equal to white men. Pennsylvania has excluded negroes from voting, after solemn adjudication, yet he found Pennsylvanians here voting for the same objectionable resolution. His colleague (Mr. Wilmot) at one time repudiated all connection with abolition, and said that he had no sympathy with the negroes, and that all he did was for the free men of the North. He voted to suppress all abolition petitions; but at this session, he not only supported the proposition to allow negroes to vote in this District, but supported all the other schemes of Slavery agitation. This showed where we are going. As a gentleman said the other day, like children we begin to creep, then walk, and next run. So with members of the House; they say that they do not wish to interfere with Slavery in the States, and to produce insurrection in the South; yet they always vote with the agitators. If they are honest, let them be consistent; let them take the beam out of their own eye before they discover the mote in their brother's. Mr. Brown contended that it was the duty of the North to deliver up fugitive slaves; but this has frequently been refused, contrary to the requirement of the Constitution. The gentleman from Bradford wants emancipation and social equality for the negroes.

Mr. Wilmot—No such thing at all.

Mr. Brown repeated that gentleman wanted the emancipating of the negro race. He had pondered on the effect of this. To him it was fearful; emancipation now, or at any time in the future, was fearful to the white race, and still more fearful to the blacks. Could any gentleman point out to him three millions of negroes without the United States, superior in morals, physical and mental endowments, to the three millions of slaves in this country? Slavery may be an evil, to produce good for the blacks, for it pleases God, in his wisdom, to place individuals, as well as nations, in bonds, to be ultimately received by a better salvation. Wherever free negroes have established themselves in a body, they have deteriorated. Who is the Governor of Liberia? He was a slave. Frederick Douglass was born a slave. Who is an eloquent divine in Liberia, and who spoke to intelligent audiences in Alabama? He was a slave; his name is Ellis. He knows the Greek and Hebrew. Slavery has not been an evil to the negro, but to the white race; and the latter, if either, deserve sympathy.

The Chairman announced to the gentleman that his hour had expired.

The same paper reports a debate on the 31st ulto. on the Slave Trade in the District.

The committee were called for reports. That on the Judiciary, through its chairman, had presented several, when

Mr. Edwards, of Ohio, from the Committee for the District of Columbia, reported a bill to prohibit the introduction, into the District of Columbia, of slaves, either for sale or hire. He moved that it be referred to the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, and be printed.

Several voices:—"What's that?" "Slavery in the District?" "What's it about?"

Mr. Wentworth's tall form arose, and he anxiously asked for the reading of the bill.

There being no objection, the Clerk proceeded to read. The chirography seemed to be bad, judging from the frequent halts of that officer. Mr. Edwards took a stand near him, to facilitate the deciphering. The bill provides,

1. The business of introducing or importing slaves into the District of Columbia for sale or hire, is prohibited.

2. If any person shall do so, or be accessory thereto, he shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and, on conviction, shall be fined $500, and be imprisoned not less than one, nor more than six months for every slave so introduced.

3. All contracts or bargains entered into, either verbally or in writing, for such purposes, shall be null and void.

4. When any citizen of the District shall bring into the District a slave, he shall within forty-eight hours, go before the Clerk of the Circuit Court and take an oath that the said slave or slaves have not been brought here for sale or hire, but brought here for his own use, and for no other purpose whatever.

5. The clerk shall give a certificate that the oath has been taken, and it is made his duty to keep a perfect record thereof.

6. The person violating these provisions, shall be arrested by the marshal or constable, and taken before some judge or justice, and held to bail or in custody, to take his trial at the next term of the criminal court; provided that this shall not apply to any person visiting the District, as now authorized by law, for a term not exceeding twelve months, for hire; and provided, that nothing shall be construed to prevent any person removing to the District from bringing their slaves with them, etc.

7. The money collected in pursuance of this act, shall be applied for the support of the poor; and

8. The Secretary of State, immediately after the passage of this act, shall cause it to be published in four newspapers, for the space of two months, and on the first of August next the act shall take effect.

The above we believe to be the outline, so far as could be gathered by the unsatisfactory manner of the reading.

Mr. Wentworth again rose.

The Speaker—The question is on ordering the bill to be printed.

Mr. Wentworth—If we vote now——

Mr. Lincoln, of Illinois, (on the other side of the hall.) I wish to make an inquiry.

The Speaker—The gentleman on the right rose to make an inquiry. ("Make it." "Go on.")

Mr. Lincoln—It is, whether or not, if we now order the printing, the bill can be ordered to be engrossed today? ("Oh no!" "Let it be printed.")

The Speaker—It may be ordered to a third reading.

Mr. Wentworth—Since I have been here, Mr. Speaker, a large number of such bills have been introduced from time to time, and the gentlemen who brought them forward should have the credit for it. The intelligence goes abroad that they have been introduced, but, at the same time, when they are referred to the Committee of the Whole, there is an end of the matter.

Mr. Sawtee, of Ohio—If my friend from Illinois will permit me——

Mr. Wentworth, (earnestly)—No. I don't trouble the House as much as the gentleman does. [Ha! ha!] I want to explain further. I hope that the gentleman who introduced the bill will go with me, and pass it this session. I trust that we will vote now. It is perhaps as good a bill as we can pass during the session; therefore, I express the hope that all gentleman in favour of the object, will vote down the motion to commit and order the bill to be engrossed.

Mr. Chapman, of Maryland, (the Chairman of the Committee for the District of Columbia)—I rise to give notice that I am opposed to this bill, as reported. As a member of the Committee, I wish to say that, however correct may be the principles gentleman may wish to carry out, this bill does not meet my sanction and approbation. I give notice, that when the bill comes up for consideration, I shall move a substitute for it, which is not yet prepared. The substitute, it is true will place the question entirely where it belongs, that is, with the corporate authorities of this District. I could not, as a member, vote for this, because it contains provisions which, in my judgment, Congress has no constitutional power to pass. I do not now mean to enter into a discussion of the principles of the bill, or to inquire what is right and proper. I mean merely to say that I am opposed to the principles of the bill, and shall, at the proper time, when the bill comes up, give my views of it as to the constitutional powers of this Government over the question of Slavery. The majority of the committee authorized the gentleman from Ohio to report the bill. A good many amendments were hurriedly adopted this morning, as is frequently the case on important matters. Therefore, there was not time to perfect the language of the various sections.

Mr. Haralson, of Georgia—Judging from the intimations of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Wentworth), I apprehend that any action taken now is not to be the final action of Congress. He tells the House that this is as good a bill as we can pass this session, evidently meaning that it is to be followed by other action. Where this is to terminate no one can foresee; but he intimates that action is not to stop here.—It is to be the entering wedge for further action. I move to lay the bill on the table.

Mr. Wentworth—Yeas and nays; let's have the yeas and nays. [Several voices: "yeas and nays."]

Mr. Robert Smith, of Illinois—I rise to make an appeal. Will the gentleman let me have the floor for a moment?

Mr. Haralson refused to withdraw the motion, and the yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. Smith—I make an appeal, only for a moment. I wish to know whether the gentleman withdraws the motion, to enable me to set myself right?

Mr. Haralson—I really would, were it not for the fact that I have refused other gentlemen.

Mr. Smith—I am misrepresented.

The Speaker—The yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. Brodhead—I wish to propound an inquiry. If the gentleman from Georgia withdraws the motion to lay on the table, will—("Order," "order," "order.") I ask of the Chair whether—("Call the roll"—"Go on with it"—"Question," "question," "order,")—whether ("Order,") if the previous question be sustained, it will not bring the House to a ("Order," "order,") vote on ordering the bill to be engrossed?

The Speaker—Yes.

Several gentlemen said something, the purport of which could not be heard for the confusion.

The yeas and nays were taken, and, by a vote of 71 to 117, the House refused to lay the bill on the table.

Mr. Robert Smith immediately rose, after the Speaker announced the result. He was understood to say—I am glad that the motion to lay upon the table did not prevail. I shall vote for the reference, that the bill may undergo examination. I am opposed to bringing these questions here, when gentlemen have no opportunity to place themselves right before the country. There is too much of legerdemain here. I have been forced to vote, without an opportunity for explanation, as a choice of evils. I will not place any gentleman in such a position. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Brown) placed me in a predicament not at all agreeable.

The Speaker interposed. Remarks are not in order in the House as to what was said in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. Smith.—I thought that I might refer to what was said there, to show the impropriety of the matter. When the subject was up some time ago, on the resolutions introduced by the gentleman from Ohio, (Mr. Giddings,) a motion was made to lay them on the table. I voted against the motion, and for that I am charged with having voted to give the blacks the right to vote as to whether Slavery shall be abolished in the District. There is not a man on this floor less inclined to extend to them this privilege than myself. I could show, by the same method of reasoning, that twenty-seven members of the South are in favour of prohibiting the Slave Trade in the District of Columbia.—The previous question was sustained by my Southern friends, who were found voting with the member from Ohio and others who profess to be Abolitionists. Would it be honest for me to apply the same rule? By voting to lay upon the table, I wished to refer the bill introduced this morning to the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union. I am willing to leave the subject there. This question has to be met, and it were better that it should be met in the spirit of fairness and candour. This charge against me did not come from gentlemen of the South, but from a Northern advocate with Southern principles. ("A Northern man with Southern principles! ha! ha! ha!") As far as the South is concerned in the possession of their property, within the limits where it now exists, I claim to be as warm a friend as the gentleman, or any other member; and I appeal to the record for the truth of this assertion. I am no agitator; I have never fostered agitation on this question. On many occasions, I have been forced to vote for a choice of evils. I have always voted, and will continue to vote, to sustain the institutions which are local. I think, however, that Slavery is a moral and political evil, and I will not give my vote or influence to extend Slavery to territories now free. (Mr. Giddings rubbed his hands, and Mr. Wentworth smiled in approbation.)

Mr. Brown, (the gentleman alluded to)—I am willing to vote for a bill to prevent the slave traffic, but not to interfere with the rights of the people of the District. I am opposed now to the agitation of the subject at all. This House is not in proper temper now to do justice to the matter. I want the discussion to be cool and calm, ("Now or never!")

Mr. Smith—I said that I would not vote to extend Slavery to territories now free; I meant to say exclude

Mr. Venable, (the Secretary of the late Southern Convention)—There is one subject on which I wish to set myself right, before the House and the country. We have been charged on several occasions, and among others, by the gentleman from Illinois, who has just taken his seat, with being fanatical on the question of Slavery. I presume that the twenty-four or twenty-five Southern men who voted for the previous question, on the occasion alluded to, come within that category.

Mr. Smith—I wish the gentleman to understand that I intended to apply my remarks to no particular gentleman. I made the remarks to apply generally, because some persons are fanatical on the subject of Slavery. I had no intention to indulge in personalities.

Mr. Venable—I am gratified with the explanation.

Mr. Brown—I know that the gentleman does not mean what he says. (Ha! ha! ha!)

Mr. Venable—I want to put the gentleman right before the country; but other gentlemen don't seem to understand it. The resolution of the gentleman from New York [Mr. Gott] to abolish the Slave Trade in the District, was accompanied by a most offensive preamble. My friend from Georgia, moved to lay it on the table, and the gentleman from Illinois voted against the motion. It was a gross insult to the South. We were compelled to present it before the House, and I voted to put the question to a test. I have always preferred the soldier's sword to the assassin's dagger. It was due to the South and to the country, to show her far defection had gone. When gentlemen from the North were constrained to vote for the preamble, I knew the ground upon which they stood; they were driven by an irresistible force at home. Suppose a proposition was made for the relief of an honourable member of this House, and the preamble said he was a scoundrel, therefore we would grant $500 for his relief—is there a man who would receive relief with such a preamble? Just so with the South; they are charged with being inimical to liberty, and gentlemen have not the nerve to vote to lay it on the table, because an irresistible force impels them. I have seen a child go into the woods to kindle a fire, and have seen the flames leap among the dry leaves and consume the whole wood. This fanaticism was very good to make thunder at home, but it was setting the country in a flame, and gentlemen have not the nerve to vote it down; and we are blamed for supporting the previous question. Gentlemen are not afraid to go home and say that they voted against the Gott resolution. I glory in having voted to sustain the previous question, because it made men say they were afraid to go home without voting for that odious proposition; and it demonstrated to the South that the abolition spirit is irresistible. I know patriotic and honest men at the North, who stand by the compromises of the Constitution; but there are others who call us fanatics. In the long history of our country, show me where the South has ever invaded the institutions of the North, or ever raised a hand and asked for anything not authorised by the grants of the Constitution. If this be fanaticism, let me ever be a fanatic. There are some who do not love the Union, but the connection. I love this sacred Union, with the love like that between man and wife; it is respected over the whole world. I love the glorious marriage ceremony, which was performed when the States came into the Union. There are some, I repeat, who love, not the Union, but the connection, and who defy every principle involved. For heaven's sake, deliver me from the man who pats me on the shoulder, takes me to his embrace, and then stabs me!

Mr. Hudson, of Massachusetts—I have repeatedly heard the accusation that members from the North are afraid of influences at home. I repel the accusation, and ask from what source does the gentleman derive his information?

Mr. Venable—I except your district.

Mr. Hudson, (sternly)—I ask no exception, and will receive none. The gentleman has repeated the assertion that Northern gentleman are afraid of their constituents, and are compelled to vote contrary to their own convictions. I ask the gentleman by what authority he hurls the imputation on me and other members? Has he not told us that the laws of his own State are right and proper and has he not intimated that he will apply the same provision to the District that exists in his own State? And has he not voted to reject utterly a bill containing no other proposition than that which exists in the laws of other States?

Mr. Venable—The laws of North Carolina contain no such provision.

Mr. Hudson—The State of North Carolina has not found it necessary to pass such laws as have been passed in Mississippi, Maryland, and Virginia, and other Slave States.—I understand that the bill read this morning, and which the gentleman voted to lay on the table, is simply applying to the District of Columbia those wise and wholesome provisions which gentlemen of the slaveholding States have adopted within their own jurisdiction.

Mr. Bayly—What laws of Virginia are similar to this bill?

Mr. Hudson—I have understood that there is a law which prevents slaves from being brought into that State for sale.

Mr. Bayly—There is no such law.

Mr. Hudson—There was. If the State has retrograded, she is entitled to all the honours. Another remark was made, that the North is perpetually encroaching on the South, and that no instance can be presented where the South has encroached on the North! I call the attention of the gentleman from North Carolina to the law which has been passed imprisoning the free citizens of the Northern States when they come within Southern borders. Is not this an encroachment on the rights of the North? A black man, in Massachusetts, is as much a citizen as a white man, and when Massachusetts came into the Union every coloured citizen was as much a citizen as any white man. The laws of Virginia, South Carolina, and other States, authorize the imprisonment of these individuals when they come into their waters; not because of crime, but the colour of their skin.

Mr. Bayly—The gentleman mistakes the laws of Virginia; he does not understand them.

Mr. Hudson—I know that the laws of Louisiana and South Carolina are similar to those to which I have referred. These States not only passed laws by which free citizens of Massachusetts and other States are imprisoned, but they have gone farther, and have passed laws which they will not permit to be annulled by the supreme tribunals of the land. All that the North asks, all that Massachusetts asks, is, that this question be brought before the Supreme Court of the United States. If the Court say that the law is right, Massachusetts will bow in submission; if the Court annul the law, she will expect that South Carolina will bow. ("That's fair!") But the South is not willing to submit to the tribunal which the Constitution has provided. If an individual of high character goes to one of these States, on suspicion he is not permitted to take the necessary steps to bring one of these questions before the Supreme Court, but is told that, unless he leaves the city of Charleston forthwith, his own life will be in danger. With such laws on the statute book, they come forward and challenge a single instance to show that the South, in any degree, has interfered with the North.

Mr. Haralson—Did not these laws grow out of the interference of the North with the South, and passed by the South, as a preventive of evil?

Mr. Hudson—If a vessel from the North touches the harbour of Charleston, and there is a coloured cook on board, who does not even set his foot on shore, an officer of South Carolina goes on board and takes the negro to the shore, and imprisons him, and the master of the vessel has to pay the necessary charges.

Mr. Rhett, of South Carolina, (in reply to Mr. Hudson.)—The gentleman is mistaken. The law is not levelled against the North, but against all the States, and against Great Britain. Does not the gentleman know that the law sprung out of an attempt at insurrection in the city of Charleston by people from the North? In making defence, did we aggress?

Mr. Hudson—I am acquainted with that portion of history which relates to Great Britain. I know that the British authorities once demanded satisfaction; and I know that this law was brought before a judge of the State Court of South Carolina; and he, a Southern judge, pronounced the law unconstitutional and void. I venture to say now that South Carolina knows too well the character she is dealing with, to enforce the law against the subjects of Great Britain.

Mr. Rhett—It has been enforced against the British Government as well as against the North. I say this with a perfect knowledge. The law has been applied with an equal hand to all. A complaint was made by the British authorities that a negro had not been in proper keeping, but put with persons who had been charged with crimes. The subject was brought before the Legislature of South Carolina.—I wish gentlemen to understand that the law has been applied to all, indiscriminately. They had not paid more deference to the lion than the people of the North.

Mr Hudson—I suppose that South Carolina would dare the world in arms. [Ha! ha! ha!] I know that a United States vessel has gone into the port of Charleston, and that a police officer has taken from on board a coloured man, and that the United States had to pay the fee. The money was taken out of the treasury for this purpose.

Mr. Holmes, of South Carolina—The gentleman is totally mistaken. ["Louder," "louder."] A negro was taken from a British merchantman, and put in jail, and Judge Johnson declared that the taking and imprisonment was unconstitutional. On this decision the British minister made a representation to Mr. Adams, and Mr. Adams referred the constitutional question to Judge Berrien, at that time Attorney General of the United States, and asked a deliberate investigation. Mr. Adams, from the decision, became convinced that the case was not unconstitutional, being merely a police regulation. He so informed the British minister, and the British minister acquiesced in the confinement of the coloured seamen. The law was passed with a view to prevent blacks coming from the North for the purpose of inciting insurrection which, at one time, by a timely discovery, was prevented from bursting on Charleston with all its horrors.

Mr. Hudson—I say that the law was pronounced to be unconstitutional and void. I am aware that other tribunals have given their decisions against the law.

Mr. Ashmun, of Massachusetts, (by permission of his colleague,)—I think that both gentlemen have overlooked the true point between the North and the South. It is not the constitutionality of the State laws. My own opinion is, that they imprison our citizens in defiance of the express provision of the constitution. I have the clause, [opening the book,] and I desire to read it: "The citizens of each State shall be entitled to all the privileges and immunities of citizens in the several States." Yet they imprison our citizens in the Southern ports.

Mr. Thompson, of Pennsylvania—is this debate in order?

The Speaker—It has taken a wide range. The Chair would have arrested it, but there were cries of "go on," "go on."

Mr. Hudson, (in reply to Mr. Ashmun)—I inform my colleague, that I made that point when I first arose. And——

Mr. Thompson—I again rise to a question of order. The gentleman is discussing the laws of South Carolina.

The Speaker—A discussion of the laws of that State is not in order. They may be alluded to, however.

Mr. Hudson—I wished to repel certain imputations. My friend from Pennsylvania has not understood me with his usual acuteness. [Ha! ha!]

Mr. Thompson—No other gentleman can.

Mr. Burt, of South Carolina (Mr. Hudson giving way)—The law of that State was passed in no hostility to Massachusetts, but was passed because it was believed indispensable to the peace and security of South Carolina. While you from Massachusetts have been complaining of this law, how is it that not one single note of complaint is uttered against Ohio, Indiana and Illinois, every one of which States has excluded from her borders your black citizens of Massachusetts?

Mr. Thompson—I call the gentleman to order.

Mr. Burt (bowing)—if the gentleman from Pennsylvania is the custodier of the order of this house, I bow to him with submission. ("Ha! ha!" "Good!" "Ha! ha!")

Mr. Thompson again rose.

Mr. Hudson—I call the gentleman to order.

Mr. Thompson—I call you to order.

Mr. Hudson (smiling)—I call my friend to order also.—(Ha! ha! ha!)

Mr. Duer—I want to say one word. ("Hear him!")

Mr. Hudson—I shall not give way. I only want to occupy two more minutes. I will make the point: the coloured citizens of Massachusetts were made so by her constitution, which existed before the establishment of the constitution of the United States. But yet they are seized and imprisoned by laws of the Southern States. Gentlemen say that this is necessary for self-preservation. We of Massachusetts contend that it is not constitutional; they of the South say it is; and in this conflict of opinion we ask that the question be settled by the tribunals of the land. The gentlemen of South Carolina prevent an appeal being taken from the State Courts. If the real sentiments, of members from the South on this floor were known, we would see as much influence behind the throne, controlling their votes, as in the Northern section of the country. And so long as they will not allow an appeal to be taken from their State Courts, do not make imputations on me and other gentlemen on this side of the question.

Mr. Burt, of South Carolina, said: This bill is different from the State laws, which intended slaves as articles of commerce or merchandise. It involves a totally different question, and touches for the first time a most interesting topic connected with Slavery. It touches the point whether Congress has the right to interpose with the sale of slaves? I trust, therefore, on such a question involved, those who may be in favour of the general principle, and those who entertain doubts of the constitutionality of such a law, will let the bill take the course of the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union. I hope that the ill-omened counsels of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Wentworth) will not prevail. What right has he to speak on a question of this kind? I say to all, with the greatest respect, that I trust they will not, for the considerations which I have indicated, force this bill through at this moment, and in this way. I doubt whether any Southern man is disposed for one moment to delay action on this bill, or any other connected with Slavery. I am prepared to meet them, but I want to see the bill printed, that all may read it. ("That's fair.")

Mr. Stephens arose, but the floor was assigned to

Mr. Taylor, of Ohio—He said, in substance: I hope that every member will vote to send this bill to the Committee of the Whole. I wish to read it, and to see whether there is anything unconstitutional in it, or not. I tell my friends that I shrink from no responsibility. I was opposed to the preamble of the resolution offered by the gentleman from New York, (Mr. Gott,) because it contained an insult. There is a struggle going on between two disappointed fragments of party. In the late Presidential contest, the gentlemen who favoured General Cass failed to effect their object. Another party, known as the Barnburners, were doubly, trebly defeated. They set their trap at Buffalo to catch a few Abolitionists. They annihilated them, and hence they come here and introduce unnecessary propositions, calculated to disturb the peace of the country, and ask us to vote on the spur of the moment, and without reflection. I sympathise not at all with the faction who assembled in May, 1848, with William Lloyd Garrison at their head, and threatened to break down the Union. I have no sympathy with them, and think that they ought to be scouted by every honest man. I will read one of the resolutions which they passed:—"Slaveholders, as such, have no right to existence on earth. (Ha! ha! ha!) They were never calculated by God to constitute any part of the human race; they are monstrous and diabolical in their origin, and no constitution or religion which endorses them as human beings is to be observed." (Ha! ha! ha!) I warn my Southern friends, while they denounce the North, not to do injustice to Northern men of moderate views. Who was the candidate of the abolition party in 1844? Birney, who was a slaveholder; and, after emancipating or selling his slaves, he went to Michigan, and became a Democratic Abolitionist. We have in Ohio a paper published by a learned gentleman from South Carolina. ("What's his name?") John C. Vaughan; he is the editor of an abolition paper in Cincinnati. We have another, a clerk to the Legislature, (so understood,) by name, Stanley Matthews, who is the editor of an abolition paper. He was a slaveholder in Tennessee a few years ago. In this city, we have an editor, named Bailey, from the State of Virginia. [Ha! ha!] He is here to propagate abolition doctrine (as the editor of the National Era). If I am wrong as to the State, gentlemen will correct me. About the time there was excitement about this establishment, I saw the name of another gentleman, appended to a card, against the efforts supposed to be made to destroy that press, and he, too, was from the South. Mr. J. Q. Adams, while on a visit to Pittsburgh, in 1843, said to a committee there, that he was against the abolition of Slavery in the District of Columbia without the consent of the inhabitants. [This, Mr. Taylor read from a paper.] Recently, there was a convention here, of gentlemen from the South—

The Speaker—Such remarks are out of order.

Mr. Taylor—Well, I voted against the resolutions of my colleague, to allow negroes to vote here on the question whether Slavery shall exist in the District. I think them unworthy to stand on the same platform with whites. I look on every effort to dissolve the Union, as proceeding from a factious spirit. I stand by the Union, and frown indignantly on any man, be he from the North or the South, who would violate its integrity. I love the Union now, and I trust that I shall love it forever.

Mr. Brown, of Mississippi, delivered a speech in defence of Southern rights, laying down what the South ought to do—to stand together and act together in the defence of their institutions, and what the North had no right to interfere with. He condemned the idea of legislating in any important matter for the people of the District of Columbia, against their consent.

Mr. Stephens followed in a few remarks. He said that he did not know that he could support all the provisions of the bill under consideration, but to prohibit the introduction of slaves into this District for traffic he was prepared to vote. He desired time to examine the bill, and, to postpone the subject, he moved that the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union; but, at the suggestion of the Speaker, he waived his motion for sundry executive communications to be received, which were laid on the table and ordered to be printed.

General Items.

Arrival of a Supposed Slaver.—The brig Independence, of New York, Owen Burns, master and owner, forty-one days from Rio Janiero, arrived at this port yesterday. The I. was seized by the United States brig Perry on the 18th Dec. 1848, off Rio, and sent home on suspicion of having been engaged in the slave trade. Lieut. James B. Lewis, prize master; Passed Midshipman Wm. T. Truxton, acting master.—*Norfolk Herald*, 31st

Constitutional Reform in Kentucky.—Meetings for this object are being held in various parts of the State. Gradual Emancipation of Slavery appears to be the principal re

Poetry.

From the Christian Citizet.

CAPTAIN DRAYTON.

In a dungeon, dark and dreary,
Cheerless, helpless, and alone,
With the damp earth for his pillow,
For his couch the unyielding stone;
With no friendly hand to aid him,
No kind voice his soul to cheer,
I behold a brother lying—
Wherefore does he linger here?

By what crime, what deed atrocious,
Has he won the felon's doom?
Hidden from the blessed sunlight,
In this prison's fearful gloom,
'Gainst a brother's life or, freedom,
Did he raise his hand to fight?
No! he dared with dauntless spirit,
To do battle for the right.

He had read the glorious language,
On the Gospel's page displayed,—
"Of one blood, earth's countless nations,
By a father's hand were made."
And upon the negro's forehead,
By his truthful spirit scanned,
He beheld the stamp of manhood,
Graven by the Eternal's hand.

Where the banner—star-bespangled,
Of a great republic waves,
With a true hearts indignation,
He beheld his *brethren*—slaves!
For their sake, his home he quitted,
Perilled freedom, life, and fame;
Risked his *all*—a sacrifice,
Worthy of a martyr's name.

'Tis for *this* I see him lying,
In that dungeon, dark and lone,
E'en within the city bearing
The loved name of WASHINGTON.
Tell it not to Europe's millions,
Panting, struggling, to be free,
That 'tis *thus* Columbia tramples
On the soul of Liberty.

Had he in a land barbaric,
For a white man's freedom sought,
By some heathen in his darkness,
Into hopeless bondage brought;
He had won a wreath of glory,
By his country's voice decreed,
And a shout of admiration,
Had approved the generous deed.

But when in a *Christian* nation,
Slavery lifts its hateful face,
And the white man holds in bondage,
Brethren of a darker race;
'Tis a crime, a deed atrocious,
To obey the voice of God,
To release the weary captive,
Break the oppressor's vengeful rod.

Be it so; on Slavery's altar,
Let the living victims stand;—
Heaven's free winds shall waft the story,
To the earth's remotest strand;
And where'er the gorgeous banner
Of the great Republic waves,
Men shall think, with pitying horror,
Of the *Christian land of slaves*.

Modbury, England. E.

NATURE AND HER LOVER.

BY CHARLES MACKAY.

I remember the time, thou roaring sea,
When thy voice was the voice of Infinity—
A joy, and a dread, and a mystery.

I remember the time, ye young May flowers,
When your odours and hues in the fields and bowers
Fell on my soul, as on grass the showers.

I remember the time, thou blustering wind,
When thy voice in the woods, to my dreaming mind,
Seem'd the sigh of the Earth for human kind.

I remember the time, ye sun and stars,
When ye raised my soul from mortal bars,
And bore it through Heav'n in your golden cars.

And has it then vanished, that dreamful time?
Are the winds, and the seas, and the stars sublime,
Deaf to thy soul in his manly prime?

Ah no! ah no! amid sorrow and pain,
When the world and its facts oppress my brain,
In the world of spirit I rove—I reign.

I feel a deep and a pure delight
In the luxuries of sound and sight—
In the opening day, in the closing night.

The voices of youth go with me still, [hill—
Through the field and the wood, o'er the plain, and the
In the roar of the sea, in the laugh of the rill.

Every flower is a lover of mine,
Every star is a friend divine,
For me they blossom, for me they shine.

To give me joy the oceans roll.
They breathe their secrets to my soul.
With me they sing, with me condole.

Man cannot harm me if he would:
I have such friends for my every mood,
In the overflowing solitude.]

Fate cannot touch me, nothing can stir,
To put disunion or hate of her
'Twixt Nature and her worshipper.

Sing to me flowers; preach to me skies:
Ye landscapes, glitter in mine eyes:
Whisper ye deeps, your mysteries.

Sigh to me winds; ye forests nod,
Speak to me ever thou flowery sod:
Ye are mine—all mine—in the peace of God.

Miscellany.

From the Literary World.

ANCIENT GOLD DIGGINGS.

The California of the Romans was SPAIN; and if a strong Government and covetous pro-consuls had not kept the game in their own hands, it is likely as much excitement would have been felt in the sea-ports, as is now apparent in New York. We have no gazette of ancient times, to tell us how many "ships of Tarshish" were chartered for Spanish ports; and it is only by occasional hints in the historians and poets, that we learn anything about the metallurgy of those days. The most striking exception to this statement is in the case of Pliny the Elder, who, in his Natural History, discourses upon all the metals, and has left us some of the most intractable nuts which are to be found in classical hermeneutics. Amidst some difficulties, arising from the technical and even barbarous terms of the art, there is, nevertheless, enough that is clear, to rebuke the ignorance of some among us, who write and talk as if gold had never been procured in large quantities save in the valley of the Sacramento.—In what follows, the authority is Pliny, except where otherwise stated. The reader will, perhaps, while these pages are before him, remember the statement of McCulloch, that "it is exceedingly doubtful whether the Carthagenians or Romans ever discovered any mines of gold and silver in Spain."* If Strabo's third book leaves any man in doubt, we can say no more.

According to the Roman naturalist, gold is found in three conditions; first, in the detritus of rivers, as the Tagus, the Po, the Hebrus, the Pactolus, and the Ganges; and this is the purest, by reason of its perpetual attrition. Secondly, shafts are sunk in the earth till a vein is reached; or advantage is taken of some breach in the mountain. Those who dig for gold always remark it as auspicious when they come to a stratum of *segullum*, a species of earth which lies above the gold. This may have been pyrites, for the *gangue*, or matrix of gold, sometimes consists of this, as well as of quartz, felspar, limestone, and inferior ores, the softer part of which might be named segullum. This word, like many other mining terms in Pliny, is of the old Spanish, and exists in the Castilian *Segullo:* philologists at once perceive its analogy with the Gothic *Gulth the* Norse *Gull*, the Danish *Guld*, and the Anglo-Saxon *Gold*. It is supposed to indicate the scoria, which generally occupies the surface, and as gold has no scoriæ, this earth was imagined to take its place.—The French commentator says it is called in France *manne*. Removing this *segullum* they gather all the sand and earth, subject it to washing, and judge of the richness of the vein from the residuum. Sometimes these veins are found at the surface, *rara felicitate*, says Pliny; which reminds us of Humboldt's testimony concerning the gold-region of Russia, where *pepitas* or masses of gold, from two to three pounds, and even from eighteen to twenty pounds, are found a few inches below the turf.* During the the reign of Nero, one such was opened in Dalmatia which yielded fifty pounds weight daily. The gold of wells, or shafts, was called *canaltium* or *canaliense;* the veins were here and there in the rock, which he calls marble, and are discovered at the sides of the shaft; from these channels it derived its name. Tunnelling was begun where there was this indication, and as they worked their way the vaults were supported by wooden pillars. The gold of these channels was pounded, washed, fired, ground to powder, or brayed in mortars; processes representative of those which are common in the Virginia mines. The product of the furnace was subjected a second time to the grinding and the fire; and the *catini* or crucibles were made of *tasconium*, a white argillaceous earth, as the only thing which could endure the heat.†

The third method, Pliny regards as Titanic: *opera vicerit gigantum.* The mountain sides are penetrated by galleries, hewn in the rock. It is sometimes months before the workmen come to the light of day; these mines are called *arrugiæ*. It is remarkable that this is the very word now used in Spain for a mine, *arrugia*.‡ These vaults sometimes fell and destroyed the miners. In their work they were met by masses of silex which, for lack of gunpowder, they worked through by means of fire and vinegar; agents celebrated in Hannibal's passage of the Alps, but in what way employed is not in evidence. It was a method which sometimes suffocated the labourers; *in cuniculis vapor et fumus strangulat;* so they betook them to forehammers, striking off masses of fifty-weight, which they had to be carrying out night and day. Nothing on earth is harder than this flint-rock, except one thing, quoth Pliny, *inter omnia auri fames durissima est*, i.e. Gold-hunger, the Californian appetite, is harder yet. When the galleries are complete, they take away the props (*cervices*), and down comes the mountain! The crash is accompanied by a sound beyond all human conception. Often all these labours and perils are undergone, and yet no gold. It was enough for them, says Pliny, as for our California emigrants, *sperare quod cupevrent.*

Another stupendous labour of antiquity, was the diverting of rivers from their beds, in order to wash the debris of these mountains. They were called in this case *corrugi:* the word *corrugi* is still found in Spanish. This is a delicate business, and requires a careful grading of the surface. A source is sought very high up, and the stream is conducted down by a race or aqueduct. Rocks were to be hewn through, and those who worked at them were sometimes suspended by cords from impending cliffs. The reservoirs, constructed near the summit, were often two hundred feet square and ten feet deep, and from thence the stream was let out by a sort of flood-gate, so as to tear everything before it. When the torrent reached its termination, on the level ground, they dug trenches, and strowed in them, at a gradation of levels, the shrub called *ulex*, which was like rosemary. When Pliny says the ulex was *retinens aurum*, it is doubtful whether he means to indicate a supposed attraction of the small particles, or only that they were caught in the prickly bush. Pits were also dug in the trenches, and provided with means to catch the gold. They used these same trenches to filter the products of the wells; the process could not be accomplished in the wells without obstructing them. The gold of the *arrugiæ* needed no process of the furnace, being pure native metal. It was found in lumps; and even the shafts or wells sometimes produced masses of considerable weight. After the bundles of ulex were dried, they were burned, and in their ashes grains of gold were found. By these processes, Asturia, Galicia, and Lusitania yielded annually the extraordinary sum of twenty thousand Roman pounds:§ of this most came from Asturia. Pliny thinks no part of the globe showed such fecundity of gold, for so long a period. He adds that unless an ancient law had forbidden mining, Italy would surpass all the earth in the precious metals, and he cites a *lex Censoria*, concerning the gold-works of the Ictimuli in the Vercellensian territory (*Borgo Vercelli,*) by which the publicans were forbidden to employ more than *five thousand men* in this mine. Siarbo speaks of these Ictimulian mines and gives the same account as Pliny in other respects, testifying that Turdetania, in the South of Spain, was more rich in precious metals than any other land. He also speaks of the gold-washing, wells, and burning.‖ Aristotle says that shepherds in Spain set fire to the woods, and that from the glowing mass molten silver flowed down.

In addition to what has been said concerning the mines of gold, there are striking indications of its abundance among the Romans. Not indeed in the earlier period, for when they were forced to buy a peace from the Gauls, it was with difficulty that they could amass one thousand pounds weight. This was the occasion, on which, according to a famous story, Brennus threw his sword into the scale, and uttered his *væ victis.*¶ During the consulate of Crassus and Pompey, there were two thousand pounds in the throne of Jupiter Capitolinus, which had been hidden there in the days of Camillus. Pliny, Virgil, and Silius Italicus, speak of the gold worn in ornament by the the Gauls:—

> "Galli per dumos aderant, arcemque tenebant;
> Aurea cæsaries illis, atque aurea vestis,
> Virgalis lucent sagulis, tum lactea colla
> Auro innectuntur."—Aen. vii. v. 657.‡

Manlius was surnamed *Torquatus*, on account of a golden *torques*, which he took from a Gaul. At the time of the invasion by the Gauls, A. U. C. 364, there were not more than two thousand pounds of gold in the city; the census showing at that time a population of 152,580 freemen. Three hundred and seven years later, Caius Marius the younger, carried from Rome to Praeneste thirteen thousand pounds of gold, after the burning of the several temples. This same sum, Sylla took back, in triumph, with seven-thousand pounds of silver; though he had already sent in, from his other conquests, fifteen thousand weight of gold, and one hundred and fifteen thousand weight of silver.

When gold became plenty, it was lavished in every public manner. The horns of bullocks, about to be sacrificed, were gilded. Brutus complains in letters from the Philippian camp, that the shoulder-clasps (*fibulae*) of the tribunes were of gold. Men wore bracelets in Pliny's time, and women carried gold on their shoes; they had no spectacles, port-crayons, or *étuis*, on which to show their wealth. The ladies (we take his testimony) were all bedecked with gold and gems, even when asleep. Pliny professes to be ashamed of his age, when he thinks of the multitude of names, recently imported from Greece, to denote varieties of luxurious vessels. The most ignoble utensils were of gold, in the house of Antonius; *in contumeliam naturæ vilitatem auro fecit.* It is remarkable that the Romans imposed on conquered nations a tribute of silver, not of gold; for example, the annual tribute of the Carthaginians, after the fall of Hannibal, for fifty years. This could not have been from any lack of precious metals, for Cyrus, upon his conquest of Asia, found a booty of thirty-four thousand pounds of gold, besides works of art. The wealth of Ebusopes, in Colchis was incredible; his palace had chambers of solid gold. When Cæsar became Dictator, and gave shows to the people, he caused all the implements of the arena to be of silver; in Pliny's time, every provincial town did the same. Caligula exhibited in the Circus, a *pegma*, or self-moving platform, holding more than a ton of silver. This pegma was a piece of theatric property, sometimes several stories high, raised and lowered by weights and pulleys. At the triumph over the Jews, Vespasian and Titus had these structures hung with tapestry, and covered with ivory and gold, so as to represent the taking of Jerusalem and other cities.** In such triumphs, the provinces used to send golden crows to the conqueror. Cneius Manlius had 200 crowns, after subduing the Gauls in Asia.†† In Cicero's days the crowns were sometimes commuted for a round sum, which was called *aurum coronarium.*

At the triumph of Claudius two golden crowns were carried, one weighing seven thousand pounds, and the other nine thousand. Nero, for the decoration of a single day, in order to show his magnificence to Tiridates, king of Armenia, covered the theatre of Pompey with gold. These were events too recent to have been exaggerated by Pliny. In his own days golden ceilings were common in private houses; a wall was gilded as though it were a vase; *parietes, qui jam et ipsi tanquam vasa inaurantur.* The gold-leaf of Prœneste was famous in the arts. Gold was applied to marble with the white of eggs; to wood by a glue called *leucophoroa;* and to copper, by mercury procured from cinnabar. The glue was probably not unlike the modern *gold-size;* and the process of *water gilding*, as applied to metals, still includes an amalgam of mercury; white of egg is used in bookbinders' gilding. It would be interesting to inquire how many of the processes of ancient art retain their place in this age of improvement.

It would be unjust to omit all the acrimonious moralising of Pliny, in regard to the metal in question. The most flagitious criminals, in his opinion, was he who first struck a gold denarius. In quest of precious metals we pursue every fibre of the earth, and live above its hollow bowels. And yet we shudder at earthquakes, as if an insulted Mother would not avenge herself. How innocent, how happy, nay, how voluptuous, *delicata*, would life be, if we could only be content with what is on the surface of the earth! Art adds its powers to nature, and the most precious of metals is made more precious still, by the hand of the artificer, *Heu, prodigiosa ingenia! quot modis auximus pretia rerum.*

Californian experience is only a repetition of a disease which prevailed in former ages; and Tarshish, Tartessus, or the valley of the Guadalquiver, was to Tyre, what San Francisco is to New York. "The Phœnicians," say Heeren, "were as eager in their quest of gold and gold countries as were the alchymists and the Europeans of the sixteenth century. The lust of gold urges them over the deserts of Arabia and the cliffs of the Red Sea, as far as Yemen and Ethiopia; and the same passion carries them westwardly to the coasts of Spain and the pillars of Hercules. Spain (says Heeren) was once the richest land in the world, for silver; gold was found there in great abundance, as well as the baser metals. The silver mountains were in those parts which the Phœnicians comprised under the general name of Tartessus, or Tarshish. The immeasurable affluence of precious metals which on their first arrival they found here, so astounded them, and the sight of these so wrought on the imagination of the people, that fact called fable to its aid, and the story gained currency that the first Phœnician colonists not only filled their ships with gold, but made of it their various implements, anchors not excepted."

It only remains to be said, that this Baetic Spain, on the river now called Guadalquiver, and the valley of its tributaries, is thought to be the TARSHISH of the Bible.

CÆSARIENSIS.

An ex-editor is contributing a series of interesting papers to *Jerrold's* (*London*) *News*, which he calls Experiences of Literature and Literary men. We make an extract:

Telesforo Trueba, already mentioned, was a merry Spanish exile, somewhat effeminate in manner, endowed with a good stock of acquired information, fond of pleasure, but capable of close application when it was required. He wrote English like a native; his style, was pure and free of foreign idiom. Novel writing being profitable, he tried his hand at that department of literature, but, unfortunately, a publisher to whom he entrusted his first manuscript deprived him of the profits. He had a small income of his own, sufficient to support him by good economy. The Spaniard is generally presumed to be of a saturnine temperament; if so, Trueba was an exception. Dancing, music—any kind of amusement—saw him a ready partaker in its pleasures.

"How do you find time to write novels, M. Trueba; you are a positive rake?"

"No, no," was his reply; "come and see me at Richmond, and you will find out the secret."

We wanted an article from him relative to Spain, and were punctually at his lodgings, near Richmond-green, on the appointed day. We found him in a retired room, looking into a garden. A table stood near the open window, covered with papers, books, and half-finished manuscripts, while the rich odour of the flowers without was wafted into the apartment.

"I slip away here," said he, "when I write, I lead the soberest life in the world. I labour for a couple of months, rarely going up to London, and when my manuscript is completed, I relax for a season; all work, or all play, is my plan."

"But you want exercise."

"I get that on the hill, or in the park, every day about three o'clock. There I have fallen in love with two pretty faces, and don't know which to prefer. I get a little conversation, too, with strangers walking there, and thus I freshen up my ideas. I put such portraits into my books sometimes. I do not desire acquaintance here. I should play the idle man too often, if that were the case. There are three hundred pounds in manuscript," said he pointing to a pile upon his table. "I shall soon be loose in London again."

His plan, for a man of like temperament, was a judicious one. A little of a beau, and desirous of being esteemed a lady's man, he was represented in *Frazer's Magazine* as dancing solus, and looking down at the rings upon his fingers at the same time, through the spectacles which he always wore, to obviate an affection of the sight.

"How do you manage your plots?"—we one day inquired. "Have you no difficulty in inventing them?" He replied that he began with one character at a hazard, and worked his plot out from it. We observed that "we" first sketched the outline, and only deviated to improve. "Your critics care little about perception of a plot. Your readers love the assumption of an air of rank. This does more for a work of fiction than much care about a plot. I know how your critics manage. They cut out the leaves of a volume and half of a novel, glance over half a dozen pages, select an extract or two, and the criticism is done. How should they know or care about the plot! I always begin in a striking way the first and the second volumes. One individual, who concots these things, tells me that a peep into the first volume, and an extract from the beginning of the second—to imply that he had read the work—is all that is required for modern criticism. The Gog and Magog Reviews—the *Edinburg and Quarterly*—settle literary merit by the politics of the party. On the continent we are more conscientious. However, I am safe. I have propitiated the cheap critics, to the extent of four or five of the most important. Your old novelists were more consistent about their plots than you are now. It is time 'hazer libro nuevo,' as we say in Spain, or 'to turn over a new leaf,' in this respect."

As we found this Spaniard knew England so well, and everything relating to society and manners, we drew from him that his mother had been an English woman, and that he had long known the language, literature, and history of the country. He returned to Spain, subsequently, became Secretary to the Chamber of Deputies on the ascendency of the Liberal party, and going to Paris on public business, died there some years since.

In the time of which we speak, the sale of a copyright of the slightest merit was certain. A liberal sum bestowed in puffing introduced the new-born to the world, and people bought and read, as if buying and reading were half the business of life. There was a system in these things, and the management in putting off a new work was a department of "trade" that showed skill in the management, and no little underhand play. Although we were, as we imagined, tolerably well up to the tricks of the "trade," we were sometimes as well duped as the public. When Horace Smith published his novel of "Brambletye House," in the palmy days of novel writing, we saw a statement of numerous parties being made up to pic-nic at that ruin. As the paper in which we observed it was published in the same county as the scene of the novel, and bore no mark of furtive concoction in London, we spoke of it as a circumstance we had observed to one of a publisher's *employés*, and a proof that Smith's work had conferred celebrity upon the spot. He smiled, and said—"That was done here and sent down to the paper; if 'you 're taken in by it, the paragraph will answer its end with other people, that is very certain."

A third foreign visitor at Lord Holland's, Mr. Blanco White, had been brought up a Catholic, and taken a vow of celibacy. He became a doubter of the Catholic creed, left Spain for England, entered the Church, and was paraded as a triumph to Protestanism by law established. Here he had fresh doubts and misgivings, and finally left the Church for the Dissenters. We have heard it whispered that in Spain love was his first disturber under his vow of celibacy, and became his torment in consequence. He was a pale, sedate, pensive looking man, deeply learned, scrupulous in conscience, and a very informing, amisable, and agreeable companion.

We must now return back to earlier times. The desire for information and thirst for reading, when secretly indulged, led us to peruse all sorts of books that came in our way. We had read the "Monk" of Lewis, which Lord Brougham's cheap literature system has introduced into every hand in the present day, with its gross immoralities. We had revelled at the theatre in the horrors of the "Castle Spectre," and read his "Tales of Wonder." In that day the belief in supernatural appearances was not to be shaken, by any incredulity upon the subject, even in some minds of a superior order. The Churchman and Dissenter were alike of the same opinion, and the Wesleyan Methodist was prostrate in credulity. To doubt that ghosts and good and bad spirits might and did sometimes appear to mortal eyes was impiety, and this though the fleshless gentry were generally said to come upon very silly errands, and sometimes upon no errands at all, else they did not condescend to reveal their business. "Hobgoblin" Lewis was then spoken of most respectfully by those who depreciated his immoral stories, as if they feared a tip-toe sprite would be on their heels if they attempted to depreciate the master spirit of all.

We should have incurred the resentment of one of the best parents that ever lived, if it had been known we perused such works. Therefore all was stealth from the fear which makes youth cunning and knavish. We had told many of those stories secretly to a sister—a bold, fine girl, several years younger than ourselves.

Our parent saw the bias in the mind of our sister, and though one of the most devoted men in the world to the duties of religion, and a nervous man too, he rejected all those wild superstitions. He surmised the fact of some impression being thus made, and who had made it. One dark, bleak winter's night, he made an offer to our sister, then not fourteen, we were older, of a reward if she would go and fetch a psalm-book out of a seat at the upper end of a chapel at the end of a long avenue of trees, with graves and tombs on all sides. Our pride was stung. We felt the blow dealt at ourselves. We boldly offered to go in our sister's place. Our chivalry vanquished our fears for the moment. The clock struck eleven. In the innocence of her heart she would have gone, and succeeded with less fear. We were endowed with the knowledge of every possible phase of spectral horror. We set out like a lion, the demons of Lewis uppermost in our mind. The wind howled fitfully along the avenue of tall trees, over grave and tomb, the dim heaven scarcely distinguishable above their tops. We reached the door, dashed it open; the echo chilled our hearts. We entered amidst total darkness—felt our way up the aisle, thinking of the skeletons in the vaults beneath. A pew door struck us from having been left open. A deadly cold made us shiver and halt, but we did not recede. We quickly discovered the cause, our adversary flying back upon its hinges. We proceeded totteringly to the upper end of the aisle, our eyes closed and feeling the pews, in terrible apprehension lest we should see something horrible. Even when feelling along the pews, we thought a bony, icy hand, might seize our own.

It sufficed that we accomplished the foregoing task, and though outwardly full of bravado, inwardly wondered at our courage, and still more that we encountered nothing more fearful than ourselves. How many thousands may thank themselves that the idle superstitions of that time, so sedulously cultivated, are now scouted, except in remote places. Who ever heard of a ghost astride on the grass-hopper of the Royal Exchange? Even the insulted spirit of Sir Thomas Gresham has never appeared to upbraid the ungrateful aldermen of London with their sycophancy having overcome their duty, in the Don Juan statute of Wellington having been placed where Gresham's own was alone legitimate. So much for a digression from Monk Lewis. We never saw him but once, just after he published his "Romantic Tales," a work long since forgotten. He disappointed us in his face, which, as we recollect, was pale. His person was small, and altogether very unlike a wizard. He made little impression on us, compared to what we expected he would do from his works.

The "Children of the Abbey," was a favourite novel of those days, written by Maria Roche, who was authoress of several other novels, but none of equal merit. Surr's "Splendid Misery" was a favourite. Miss Edgworth's "Popular Tales," and "Hermsprong," by an author whose name we forget, were eagerly read. Mrs. Opie's "Mother and Daughter" were thought excellent, making what is now called "a sensation." We fell in with the works of Godwin, too, in whom, of all the novelists of that time, we found materials that set us thinking. No English author has been more unjustly treated than this original, bold, and clever writer; he will one day be revived, and become as fresh as the noble and honest De Foe. His disquisitions aside, which show that high-minded fearlessness of inquiry which is the dread of superstition; his novels are of first-rate merit, at least his "Caleb Williams" and "Mandeville." His English is firm, vigorous, and pure. Godwin was more prized by the educated than by the bulk of circulating library readers. His "Caleb Williams" we still think one of the best works of fiction ever written. His conversational powers were very considerable. He was simple in person, and small statute.

The "Novice of St. Dominic," by Lady Morgan, and her "Wild Irish Girl," we remember reading about this time. Walcot (Peter Pindar) diverted the public by his pungent satires, and the late Laureate published his "Madoc." These, and all that was readable beside coming in our way, we eagerly perused, though without judgment to discriminate merit, yet not with equal pleasure in every case.

The great defect of the school of novelists previous to Scott, was, that it relied almost wholly upon imagination, and revelled in extravagances without number, forgetting fiction must harmonize with natural truth. Of the more distinguished writers many contained here and there fruitful delineations, but by far the greater number relied upon fancy in place of an accurate observation of existing things, even in describing the inanimate world.

FULFILMENT OF PROPHECY.

The following article is copied from the Boston Transcript:

"In the year 1792, there was reprinted in Boston, an unpretending little work, which had been originally published in London, nearly a century before, namely, in the year 1701, entitled, "the Rise and Fall of Papacy, by Robert Fleming." The cause of its republication was the astonishment and interest excited by the verification of its interpretations of prophecy in regard to the fall of the French Monarchy. We say interpretations of prophecy; for Mr. Fleming merely aspires to the rank of an interpreter of the mystical vaticinations of the author of Revelations. He assumes at the outset that Biblical students are agreed upon certain points; such as that Papal Rome is the Babylon of the Apocalypse; that the seven heads of the beasts are the seven forms of civil government that succeed each other in the Roman nation; that the government of the Pope is the last of the seven. He then maintains, that the 1260 days spoken of under the several forms of "42 months," "a time, times and a half time," &c. are to be taken for 1260 years. He holds that Anti-Christ began his reign in the year 606—for the Papal form of Government was to be the last of the forms, and the one immediately succeeding the kingdom of Orstro-Goths, the kingdom that was "to continue but a short space." in that year this kingdom passed away, and the title of Universal Bishop was given to the Pope, and soon after idolatry was publicly authorized in Rome. In this year it was first ordained that public worship should be conducted in Latin. From this time there was a commencement and gradual expansion of Papal power.

"On the subject of the outpouring of the vial he says, "There is ground to hope, that in the beginning of another such century, (he wrote in 1701, a century before the time of which he speaks,) things may again alter for the better. For I cannot but hope that some new mortification of the chief supporters of Anti-Christ will then happen, and perhaps the French Monarchy may begin to be considerably humbled about that time. * * But as to the expiration of this vial, I fear it will not be until the year 1794." This was most exactly fulfilled in the revival of Protestant religion which succeeded that.

"From another course of remarks he draws the conclusion in this more distant form: "Therefore we may justly suppose that the French Monarchy, after it had scorched others, will consume its fire and waste, till it has exhausted at last toward the end of this (that is, of the last) century."

"These verified interpretations were considered so remarkable as to justify the republication of the book in 1792. But why is it, that a new edition has appeared at this time in the city of New York? Mr. Fleming is right again. Fixing the commencement of the Papal power at 606, and making its duration 1260 years, he calculated we should find "the beginning of the end" to be 1866. But the prophetic reckoning was according to the then existing mode, 350 days for a year: whereas actual time ruins, according to the Julian mode, 365 days, 5 hours, 4 minutes, 57 seconds, for a year—making the number 1260 less by 18 years. So that according to Mr. Fleming, the real time for the fall of Popery to commence would be in 1848. Speaking of the Pope, he says: "He cannot be supposed to have any vial poured out upon his seat so as to ruin his authority so signally as this judgment must be supposed to do, until the year 1848. * * * But we are not to imagine that *this vial will totally destroy the Papacy*, though it will exceedingly weaken it."—Fleming had previously assigned the commencement of this century, corresponding with Napoleon's attack upon the authority of Rome, for a great obscuration of Popery. By the fixing of the year 1848 for the vial that would greatly weaken, though not destroy its most remarkable, for never has the Papal authority been so near its downfall as within the last four months, when the Pope seemed to have lost all that Prestige that surrounded him so far that the people were on the point of imprisoning him.

"But it is not in regard to Popery alone that Mr. Fleming shows his acuteness of interpretation. Alluding to the destruction of the French monarchy by the former revolution, he says:—"This judgment will probably begin about the year 1794, and expire about the year 1848." Upon this, the New England Puritan remarks with no unwarrantable emphasis. "Now here is something truly wonderful—that, writing a hundred years before the time first named, he should have fixed on 1794, for the era of the first French revolution, which was to begin the destruction of the French monarchy, and on 1848 as the year which was to finish it. A single correspondence between the prophecy and the fulfilment is wonderful; but such a double one, showing both the beginning and the end, is still more so." Coupled with the prophecy in regard to Popery, it may well justify the attention that has been re-awakened to Mr. Fleming's remarkable work."

JONATHAN'S GOLDEN HARVEST.

(From our American Correspondent.)

I EXPECT you have read in some of them Greek and Roman story-books, that makes the chief part of the schoolin of you Britishers, the yarn of JASON and the Golden Fleece, and also about the Golden Apples of the Hesperides. The Golden Fleece, I take it, was great cry and very little wool, and I estimate that the Golden Apples warnt no ways comparable to New Town Pippins. Well, however, I can tell you that American Truth flogs Ancient Mythology—that's a fact. We've got a real Golden Chersonesus in California, and genuine Pactolus in the river Sacramento. I guess MIDAS would have give his ears for our Mormon Diggins, and old CRŒSUS would have swopped Lydia for San Francisco. TOM TIDLER'S ground arn't nothen to this here location. There's not a little gutter flowing into the main stream but what, with a couple of active niggers, you may scrape ten thousand dollars-worth of gold out on it in one week. You've only got to walk into the bed of the river and pick up the pebbles, which is a'most pure buffion. The very airth of the banks stumps your March dust, a bushel of which I've heer'd say, is worth a king's ransom.—The Scotch labourers in these 'ixins saves the very scrapins of their shoes, and whittles their nails into the melting-pot. I calculate that a month's diggin at the banks of the Sacramento would be a better speculation for your physical force Chartists, than the plunder of the Bank of England.

Well; here we are in a state of excitement that beats any camp-meeting I ever sighted. Young and old off we go, leavin our trades and callins, our stores and families, away to California like flocks of pigeons. Our Golden Fever caps your Railway Mania. By the last accounts there was to be seen the glorious spectacle of four thousand of our enterprisin citizens a scratchin and scrapin away in the Sacramento from mornin to night, as fast as so many bears arter white honey. The common wages of helps is thirteen dollars a-day; you may get eight-and-forty for a bowie-knife, and eighty for a blanket; besides doin a powerful deal of business with the benighted Ingines in printed stuffs and ribbons.

The advan-ages of this here splendoriferous discovery to our great country will be inestimable. I compute that we shall soon see no such a thing as a cent in all our model Republic. We won't demean ourselves by a currency of small change under silver. I contemplate that we are set up with our gold mines to all eternity, and shall have nothin to do but lay up our heels, enjoyin our cigars and mint-juleps for everlastin. In course, we shall be masters of the whole world, for gold is the sinners of war, and our pockets bein chock full on it, will enable us to lick universal creation.

The Europeans, and especially you Britishers, will be our slaves and niggers; we shall chuck our pusses to you and take your manufactures, which you, poor critturs, will come and lay at our feet.—We shall leave you varmint to produce, while we only consume. We shall be a kinder Aristocracy among the nations of the airth. We shall knock our glasses and crockery into an immortal smash, and all eat and drink out of gold plate. When we go a shootin' we shall load our rifles with golden bullets. We shall roll and waller in gold, like hogs in a swamp, or the sea-serpent among the foaming billers. But you'll tell me, perhaps, that gold, in the mean time, may become dirt cheap, and that we may find ourselves in the end overloaded with yellow rubbish, and destitute of the rale wealth of nations, which arter all is their industrial produce.—You may pint to the example of Old Spain in proof of what may come of gold mines. Bu don't you give us none of your bark. It won't cure us of our gold fever, nohow, I tell you. You'll only rile us, and make us wicked ugly, and provoke that dander which, when riz. is a mixtur of the airthquake and the alligator, with a touch of the lightnin.—*Punch.*

PREJUDICE AGAINST COLOUR—ITS EXTENT.

To the Editors of The British Friend:

DEAR FRIENDS,—Your favourable review of my recent publication, "A tribute for the Negro," encourages me to hope that it may be instrumental in removing the groundless prejudices existing towards the most oppressed and degraded portion of our race.

Being desirous of making a few observations on the *extent of this prejudice* entertained against the Negro race, with your permission I will endeavour to do so as briefly as possible. I have no doubt that you are yourselves fully satisfied of the fallacy of the idea that there exists in the Negro an inherent inferiority, a doctrine as erroneous as it is dangerous, yet I fear, indeed I am sorry to be aware that you have formed too favourable an opinion of the views entertained by some of your readers on this question.

Whilst preparing my work for the press, letters were received from philanthropists not only in this country but in Ireland and America, asserting that any proposition as to the equal capabilities, mentally, of the Black and White races of man, could not be maintained without much stronger proofs than any that had yet been adduced to demonstrate such to be the case. The parties alluded to, were most of them to my certain knowledge, readers of *The British Friend*, members of our Society, and not of low standing in the church. Within the last fortnight, I have been informed of a Friend not sixty miles hence entertaining similar views; who has, on this ground, strenously discouraged the introduction of it (the "Tribute to the Negro,") amongst his circle of friends, as well as opposed its admission into a book society in his vicinity, and his position in a literary point of view has given weight to his opposition.

Sorry should I be were such an opinion at all prevalent amongst us. Whilst evidence has arisen of its existence to some extent, I rejoice in believing that on this side of the Atlantic at least, we are nearly exempt from prejudicial feeling against any portion of our fellow-creatures; who, whatever opinion may be entertained of them, are, nevertheless, our brethren, and we all are "the children of one heavenly Father."

The extent to which the prejudicial feeling against the Negro exists in other quarters, I find (from correspondence which my publication has led to) to be very great. The following extracts from the private journal of a Friend, who travelled with Thomas Clarkson a few years ago, prove the existence of ideas as erroneous as they are dangerous; but which, is to be hoped, are giving way to views more consonant with truth and justice:

"I drove T. C. to ——. Here he endeavoured to interest the Vicar in behalf of the oppressed Africans; but apparently in vain. This professed minister of the Gospel expressed his dissatisfaction with what the Abolitionists had already done, declaring his belief that much mischief had arisen from abolishing the Slave-Trade, and "that it was likely the Negroes would cut the White men's throats." Indeed the man used such arguments in favour of the iniquitous system of Slavery as induced T. C. to suspect he was either immediately or remotely interested therein.

"After our visit to the Vicar, we called on the Chief Magistrate of the Borough, who proved his ignorance by attempting to shew that in point of intellect the Africans were naturally inferior to Europeans; his argument being founded on the fact of their being at the present time in a state of bondage; which he contended would not be the case had their mental powers been equal to our own:—thus overlooking the captivity of the Jews and other nations of antiquity, wherein no evidence of intellectual inferiority has on that account been adduced. I observed that the moral degradation in which they were held must necessarily depress those intellectual qualities which, under more advantageous circumstances, might be brought into exercise; reminding him that when the ancient Britons, under the guidance of the Druids, offered their children to idols, by burning them in wicker baskets, it seemed probable that they occupied as low a place in the scale of being as the untaught African of the present day; and that as by education, an improved condition had accrued to our own country so by an application of the same means to the Negro, there could be no reason to doubt of the same happy result. The Chief Magistrate was too superficial to enter on a serious inquiry into the right of exercising that domination over the lives and liberties of others, which the White men assume over their Coloured brethren. We parted with little satisfaction."

I am, very sincerely, your friend,

A THE AUTHOR OF "A TRIBUTE FOR THE NEGRO."

Leeds, 12th Month, 20th, 1848.

[*British Friend.*]

From Foreign Publications.

Punch gives a seasonable moral:—"If you wish to do good at this season of the year, do it for goodness sake."

La Democratic Pacifique says, that Lamartine's "Meditations," and some of his other works, have been translated into Chinese by order of the Emperor.

At the last sitting of the Academy of Sciences, Paris, Sir David Brewster was elected one of the eight foreign associate members of the National Institute of France, vacant by the death of the celebrated chymist, Berzelius.

MORAL CAUSES.—Moral causes noiselessly effaced first the distinction between Norman and Saxon, and then the distinction between master and slave. None can venture to fix the precise moment at which either distinction ceased. Some faint traces of the old Norman feeling might perhaps have been found late in the fourteenth century. Some faint traces of the institution of villenage were detected by the curious so late as the days of the Stuarts; nor has that institution ever, to this hour, been abolished by statute.—*Macaulay's History of England.*

Is Slavery [exclaims *Jerrold's News.*] not only to be the handmaiden, as she now is, of American Republicanism, but to be spread, to be perpetuated? Is the accursed thing to be spread with the language which may be spoken by no *slave* in the dominions of Queen VICTORIA?

BONAPARTE AND O'BRIEN.—On the 25th MAY, 1845, Louis Napoleon Bonaparte made his escape from Ham. On the very same day Smith O'Brien was discharged from the coal cellar of the House of Commons, after twenty four days' imprisonment. In December 1848, Louis Napoleon is President of the French Republic; Mr. Smith O'Brien a prisoner and all but forgotten.

LOLA MONTES IN LONDON.—This favourite of majesty, when majesty was powerful in Bavaria attended on Saturday at Nicholson's Wharf, something about some baggage, made a declaration before the authorities in the long room of Custom House, respecting them, which she attested with the signature of "Marie, Countess of Landsfelt."—*Jerrold's News.*

LOUIS LUCIEN BONAPARTE.—This gentleman's features and general appearance more resemble the Emperor's than is the case with any of his kinsmen. There was some curiosity manifested to hear him when he appe